CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY:

ITS

DOCTRINES AND ORDINANCES.

Fifth Edition.

HRISTIAN THEOLOGY:

ITS

Doctrines and Ordinances

EXPLAINED AND DEFENDED.

BY

WILLIAM COOKE, D.D.,

HOR OF 'THE DEITY,' 'THE SHEKINAH,' 'THE THREE INTERCESSIONS,'
'EXPLANATIONS OF 500 TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE,' ETC.

Fifteenth Thousand.

LONDON:
HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.,
PATERNOSTER ROW;
H. WEBBER, 4, LONDON HOUSE YARD, E.C.
1869.

LIBRARY OF
Knebrake Theological Seminary
BT
772.3
.C66
1869
4382

NO LONGER PROPERTY OF
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY

JOHN CHILDS AND SON, PRINTERS.

PREFACE TO THE FIFTH EDITION.

THIS Work was originated by circumstances which, in the judgment of the Author and many intelligent Christians of various Denominations, loudly called for a defence of the truth. The original design of the Work determined the special selection of topics, and circumscribed the pen of the writer. In the Second and Third Editions, the volume was considerably enlarged by additional arguments on the Unitarian controversy. The book having obtained a circulation far beyond the anticipations of the Author, and a Fifth Edition being called for, duty and encouragement have induced the Author to extend the range of subjects, so as to furnish a more comprehensive defence of Christian doctrine, and a more complete system of Theology. He has supplied nine new chapters, on the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, the Immortality of the Soul, the Doctrine of Purgatory, the General Resurrection, Eternal Retribution, the Ordinances of Baptism, and the Supper of our Lord, Holy Angels, and Devils.

From necessity, and not from choice, the Work is controversial throughout. The Author felt it a sacred duty to

meet without reserve the objections which Infidelity, Unitarianism, Formalism, Universalism, Popery, and other systems of error, present to the precious truths of the Gospel, and thus to furnish a defence, as well as an exposition, of Doctrinal Christianity. On some points, indeed, he has had to controvert the views of brethren whose friendship he highly values, and whose piety and usefulness he greatly admires; but if love for the Truth has compelled him to speak with freedom, love for the brethren has, he trusts, inspired candour and restrained from asperity. 'Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ.'

Forest Hill, London,
July, 1869.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHAPTER I.	
E Holy Scriptures: their Divine Authority ..	17—39
CHAPTER II.	
E Holy Scriptures: their Infallible Inspiration ..	39—66
CHAPTER III.	
E Holy Trinity	67—83
CHAPTER IV.	
E Deity of Jesus Christ	83—146
CHAPTER V.	
E Personality and Godhead of the Holy Spirit ..	146—178
CHAPTER VI.	
E Original State of Man, and Human Depravity ..	179—208
CHAPTER VII.	
E Atonement of Christ	209—240
CHAPTER VIII.	
E Atonement of Christ	240—270
CHAPTER IX.	
ECTION and Reprobation	270—306
CHAPTER X.	
STIFICATION by Faith	306—337
CHAPTER XI.	
E Witness of the Holy Spirit	338—364

PAGE

CHAPTER XII.

THE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION .. .. .. 364—393

CHAPTER XIII.

THE DOCTRINE OF ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION .. .. 393—419

CHAPTER XIV.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL .. .. .. 419—444

CHAPTER XV.

PURGATORY PROVED TO BE UNSCRIPTURAL 444

SECTION I.—Christ's Descent into Hell disproved .. .. 446—463

SECTION II.—Christ's Preaching to the Spirits in Prison .. 463—474

SECTION III.—The Trial by Fire .. .. .. 475—484

SECTION IV.—Other Texts considered .. .. .. 485—501

SECTION V.—Purgatory opposed to the whole tenor of Scripture 501—505

CHAPTER XVI.

THE GENERAL RESURRECTION .. .. 505—522

CHAPTER XVII.

ETERNAL RETRIBUTION .. .. 522—530

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH .. .. 530—554

CHAPTER XIX.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY .. .. 554—574

CHAPTER XX.

THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM .. .. 574—602

CHAPTER XXI.

THE ORDINANCE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER .. .. .. 602—610

CHAPTER XXII.

THE HOLY ANGELS .. .. 610—626

CHAPTER XXIII.

FALLEN ANGELS .. .. 627—633

INDEX.

ABBA, Father, its meaning explained, 346.
Adoption, its nature unfolded, 342.
Angel of Jehovah, applied to Christ, 134.
Angels, their personal existence proved, 610—their spiritual nature, 613—their number great, 614—their various orders, 615—their holiness, 618—their benevolence, 618—their intelligence, 619—their great power, 620—their agency, 621—their ministry to man, 623.
Angels instructed and benefited by man's redemption, 268.
Apollyon, its meaning, and applied to the chief of apostate angels, 631.
Article, the Greek, its use in construction, 91.
Atheism, its discomfiture, 37—its horrid gloom, 439.
Atonement, the doctrine stated, 210.
—— meaning of the original terms employed, 218.
Atonement, the argument: not a moral influence, but a real propitiation, 212—proved by the salvation of infants, 214—by sacrificial institutions, 215—by the various terms employed expressive of atonement: propitiation, 217—redemption, 221—satisfaction, 227—reconciliation, 229—mediation, 235—all blessings given through Christ, 236.
Atonement proclaimed in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, 241.
Atonement proved by the priesthood of Christ, 243.
—— sufferings and death of Christ an inexplicable mystery without the atonement, 248.
Atonement, objections answered, 261.
Atonement unfolds the character of God, 266.
Baptism, its authority and obligation, 574.
Baptism, its nature and import: takes the place of circumcision, 575—inaugurates a new dispensation, 575—a profession of faith in the true and only God, 577—is a solemn dedication to God's service, 578—a sign and seal of God's covenant, 578—the initiatory rite of admission to God's Church, 580—but does not constitute regeneration, 581.
Baptism, the proper subjects of: adult believers not previously baptized, and infant children, 583—reasons for infant baptism: all infants are in a state of actual salvation, 584—all infants are and ever have been recognized by God as actual members of his true spiritual Church, 585—the Christian dispensation perpetuates and enlarges the spiritual privileges of the ancient economy, 587—the Apostles bap-

Immortality of the soul proved from Scripture, 430.
Immortality of the soul, rational evidence of: general belief in, 433; universal desire for, 434; voice of conscience, 438; inadequate retribution in this life requires a future state, 440; vast capacities of the soul fit it for eternal existence, 441; therefore the law of adaptation requires immortality for the soul, 442.
Imputed righteousness considered, 321.
Incarnation of Christ, his condescension therein, 123.
Incarnation of Christ not incompatible with his dignity, 125.
Infants proper subjects for baptism, 583.
Infants in a state of salvation, 584.
Inspiration of Holy Scriptures defined, 39, 54-56.
—— professed by the sacred writers, 44-54.
—— promised by Christ, 53—and actually given, 48.
—— verbal where necessary, always infallible, 56.
Intercession of Christ, its mode and efficacy, 257.
Jehovah-Elohim, expressive of plurality and unity of nature, 75.
Judgment, general, certainty and uncertainty, 522.
Justification by faith, doctrine stated and argued, 306-337—meaning of original word, 307—includes pardon and acceptance, 309—this view illustrated, 310-313.
Justification by faith does not exempt from natural consequences of sin, 314—does not include final perseverance, 315.
Justification by faith the only way of salvation, 316—works of the law, whether moral or ceremonial, cannot justify, 316-321; nor the mere mercy of God, 319; nor a speculative faith, 321—the faith that justifies is combined with repentance, has special reference to Christ, and includes trust or reliance on him, and works by love, 323-329—this God's method of salvation in every age, and under every dispensation, 329.
Justification by faith is worthy of God, adapted to man's helplessness, unites the soul to God, promotes humility, generates hatred to sin, inspires gratitude, stimulates to obedience; and continued faith is essential to continued justification, 330-337.
Kennicott, Dr, on the integrity of the Sacred Scriptures, 66.
Law written on the heart, Cicero and Sophocles thereon, 439.
Law cannot justify the sinner, 316.
Life, meaning of the name Eve, 194.
Lord's Supper, its authority and design, 602.
—— commemoration of a great fact: death of Christ, 602.
—— proclamation of a fundamental doctrine, 603.
—— commemoration of infinite love, 603.
—— sign and seal of God's covenant, 604.
—— a badge of discipleship with Christ, 604.
—— means for the communion of saints, 605.
—— how it ought to be observed: with sincerity, charity, faith in Christ, personal consecration to God, joyous anticipation of Christ's second coming, 605-610.
Love, Perfect, identical with entire sanctification, 404.

erialism, its licentiousness and immorality, 439.
nodism, its wonderful success, 572.
stry, Christian, The, a divine institution, 554.
stry, The, includes both a clerical and a lay agency, 555; this is reasonable, 556; proved from facts under the Jewish dispensation, 557; also from the New Testament, 558.
stry, The, has a rational and Scriptural claim to adequate support, 560—objections answered, 563—clerical ministry defended, 565—God has owned with his special blessing the united ministry, lay and clerical, 572.
aculous conception, proof of human depravity, 205.
tery of the incarnation, 87—of Christ's death explained, 248.
logists and sceptics, their discomfiture by facts, 25.
nions and theories, human, evanescent, 22.
ginal state of man and human depravity, 179-208.
— traditions of, 180—Scriptural record of, 181—man made in God's image, 182—his probation, conditions of, wise, equitable, and benevolent, 185-188.
ginal state of man and human depravity, the temptation, 189—the fall, 191—consequences on himself, spiritual and temporal, 192-197; on all his posterity, 198.
ginal sin, man's apostasy and penalty of, 189-198.
ristic writers on Deity of Christ, 132.
l and James reconciled on doctrine of justification, 326.
sonality and Deity of the Holy Spirit proved, 146-178—personality proved by having all the properties of a conscious, intelligent, voluntary being, 147—by being united with the Father and the Son in the formula of baptism, 67, 71, 82, 168.
sonality and Deity of the Holy Spirit: names of God applied to him, 150; attributes and perfections of God, 152—the works and prerogatives of God, 154—his supreme majesty asserted, 167.
sonality and Deity of the Holy Spirit: he is supremely worshipped in baptism, 169; in Jewish form of benediction, 171; in apostolic benediction, 173; by the whole hierarchy of heaven, 175.
sonality and Deity of the Holy Spirit, objections answered, 147, 149, 170, 177.
raoh hardened his own heart, 285.
losophers and poets, heathen, on man's original state, 180—on human depravity, 203—on the law of Nature, 439—on man's immortality, 434, 435, 436, 437—on purgatory, 444.
destination, doctrine disproved, 349—first introduced by Augustine, 305.
pitiation, its meaning and application to Christ's death, 218-226.
vidence, its administration not complete on earth, 440.
vidence subordinated to the purposes of grace, 510.
gatory derived from heathenism, 445.
gatory has no support from Apostles' Creed, 449—that creed itself of no authority, because not derived from apostles, 446.
gatory no support from Holy Scripture, 446.

Purgatory: Christ's supposed descent into hell disproved, 446—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell" (Ps. xvi. 10) explained, 446-463.
—— Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison (1 Pet. iii. 19, 20) has no allusion to purgatory, 463—the passage explained, 465
—— the trial of every man's work by fire (1 Cor. iii. 11, 12) has no allusion to purgatory, 475—the text explained, 479.
—— cast into prison until the last farthing be paid (Matt. v. 25, 26) has no reference to purgatory, 485—the text explained, 487.
—— the sin that is not forgiven in this world or in the world to come (Matt. xii. 32) no reference to purgatory, 489—meaning of text explained, 491.
—— 'Iniquity not purged till ye die' (Isa. xxii. 14) has no reference to purgatory, 493—meaning of text explained, 494.
—— rich man and Lazarus not in purgatory (Luke xvi. 19-31), 495—meaning of text explained, 496.
—— Rev. xxi. 27 has no allusion to purgatory, 498—meaning of text explained, 499.
Purgatory, doctrine of, opposed by the whole tenor of Holy Scripture, 501.
Purgatory, doctrine unknown in ancient Church, 449—opposed by some eminent Papal doctors, 445—doubted by others, and confessed not to be proved by Holy Scripture, 445-6.
Reason, its province distinct from revelation, 41.
Regeneration, Doctrine of, explained, 364—does not imply a change in the substance of the soul, but in its moral qualities, 368—the understanding enlightened, 368—the conscience quickened and rectified, 369—the will renewed, 370—the affections purified, 371.
Regeneration, how manifested in the life: overcoming the world, 373—dominion over sin, 373—habitual attendance on the means of grace, 377—holy conversation, 377.
Regeneration does not obliterate mental idiosyncrasies, 378.
Regeneration distinct from justification, and follows it, 379.
Regeneration progressive in its antecedents, yet instantaneous itself, 381.
Regeneration absolutely required, 381—is essential to our obedience, to our holiness, happiness, present and eternal, 381, 384.
Regeneration effected not by baptism, but by the Holy Ghost, 385-392.
Repentance cannot atone for transgression, 212, 222, 224, 319.
Resurrection of Christ, proof of validity of his atonement, 256.
Resurrection of the dead, in harmony with man's original state, and necessary to the perfection of the Redeeming economy, 505.
Resurrection, direct evidence of, clearly and fully revealed in Holy Scripture, 506.
Resurrection, objections answered: dissolution is not annihilation, 508—nor re-composition of dissolved parts impossible, 509—every scattered particle perceived by an omniscient God, 509—and is subject to infinite power, 509—cannibalism no barrier to resurrection of the body, 510—Providence concurs to fulfil what grace has promised, 510.
Resurrection in harmony with analogy of Nature, 511.
Resurrection, character of the glorified body: identity, 513—human form the type, 514—yet greatly superior in its properties, incorruptible,

515; glorious in aspect, 516; vigorous, 517; spiritual, 517; will resemble our Lord's glorified body, 519; adapted to the soul, 520.
rrection, the wicked will be raised for eternal punishment, 521.
bath, The, an original and permanent institution, 530-546.
— appropriation of one day in seven to rest and religion ordained at the creation of man, 531—observed before the law was given, 532—known to the heathen, 535—objections answered, 536.
bath, The, re-enacted from Sinai as a moral duty, placed in the decalogue, 537—enforced as a moral duty, when the Jewish dispensation was declining, 538—objections answered, 539.
bath, The, was made for man, as a duty and a privilege, 541; required for the welfare of both body and soul, 542; and is therefore of permanent obligation, 544.
bath, The, a type of heaven, and remains in force until the antitype is come, 545.
bath, the day changed, does not affect its essential character or purpose, 546—He who ordained its observance has authority to change its time, 547—reasons for the change sufficient, 548—the change effected by God's providence, 549—the first day observed by the Apostles and first Christians, 550; and was distinguished by them as 'the Lord's day,' 551—this day was signalized by glorious events, 552.
ellianism, doctrine stated and refuted, 70.
ctification, meaning of original terms explained, 393.
ctification, doctrine unfolded, 394-419.
ctification, entire, negatively considered: does not imply absolute perfection, 399—nor angelic perfection, 399—nor Adamic perfection, 400—nor perfection in knowledge, 400—nor freedom from temptation, 400—nor exemption from danger, nor extinction of animal instincts and passions, 401—nor incessant rapture, 401—nor constant thinking on God, 402—nor independence of Christ's atonement, 402.
ctification, entire, positively considered: entire separation from sin not only in habit and desire, but from evil tempers and consciousness of sin, 403—entire dedication to God, 403—identical with 'perfect love,' loving God with all the heart, 403.
ctification the duty and privilege of the Christian—God wills it, 405—God is able as well as willing to do it, 405—he is faithful, 406—has made provision in the Gospel for it—efficacy of Christ's blood, 406—the blessing promised, commanded, exemplified, 407.
ctification, entire, objections examined and refuted, 411.
an, meaning of the term applied to the chief of apostate angels, 631.
isfaction to justice, a Scriptural term, 227.
iptures, Holy—*see* Bible.
en Spirits, the, proved to be the Holy Ghost, 174.
against Holy Ghost, 167—St Ambrose on, 167.
ls, intermediate state of, 432, 469.
nsubstantiation, opinions of the Fathers thereon, 609.
nsubstantiation, the doctrine stated, unscriptural, irrational, contradicted by our senses, 606.

Transubstantiation not held by the Primitive Church, nor by the Fathers, their views stated, 608.
—— historically proved to be a human invention, 609.
—— the opposite doctrine asserted by the Fathers, 609.
Trinity—*see* Holy.
Tritheism, doctrine stated and refuted, 72.
Unitarianism, its errors exposed and refuted, 69-178.
Unity of God compatible with Trinity, 69.
Vail of the Temple, its typical design, 255.
Volney, Voltaire, and other sceptics, their efforts confounded, 26, 28.
Westminster Confession of Faith, 271.
Witness of Holy Spirit, sentiments of eminent divines, 362.
Witness of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine unfolded, 338-364—privilege asserted and proved, 348-355.
Witness of Holy Spirit, evidence stated: testimony of the Holy Ghost, 344; is direct and immediate, 347; excludes doubt and fear, 348; is the love of God shed abroad in the heart, 350; is God's seal, 351; the earnest of his Spirit, 351; identical with the light of God's countenance, 352.
Witness of the Holy Spirit does not exclude all kinds of sorrow and grief, 356—special cases of mental darkness considered, 356.
Witness of our own spirit: the testimony of our own judgment and conscience, 357—union of the two witnesses, 359—the utility of this conjoined testimony, 359—the sentiments of pious and learned divines on the witness of the Spirit, 362.
Xenophon quoted on soul's immortality, 435.
Young children, their relation to Christ and his Church, 214, 580, 583.

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES—THEIR DIVINE AUTHORITY.

Bible, from which Christianity derives its authority and lorious truths, is confessedly a wonderful book; the most lerful, indeed, of all books in this or any preceding age. wonderful in antiquity. Though one in its authority and ose, the Bible consists of a collection of separate docu-s, written by different authors, remote from each other in time and place. The latest writer carries us back to a od of about 1800 years; but the earliest claims a date of ess than 3300 years, and records events which go back to beginning of time. In antiquity, this volume stands un-led. Manetho and Berosus, Confucius and Herodotus, all posterior to Moses by more than one thousand years; even the bard of the 'Iliad' comes six centuries later the more venerable author of Genesis. Where the most ent records lose their events in the dim regions of fable, Bible declares, in clear and sober narrative, the origin of ns, of man, and of the world itself. In sublimity, as well tiquity, the Bible has no compeer. Poets and orators have led their genius at its altar, borrowed their richest imagery its rhetoric, and their loftiest eloquence from its in-tions; yet oft have confessed their feebleness in the pre-e of its overpowering majesty. Compared with the inimit-sublimity and grandeur of Moses, David, Isaiah, Paul,

and John, the most admired odes of heathen antiquity are but like the trifling effusions of children. In pure, refined, and comprehensive morality, the Bible has no rival. It inculcates every duty we owe to ourselves, our fellow-men, and our God; it places its Divine ethics upon an immutable foundation, and enforces them by the high authority of Jehovah and the awful responsibilities of an eternal world. Wonderful, too, is this old book in the discoveries which it unfolds. It shows us God, his nature, attributes, and perfections; his relation to his creatures, his moral government and providence. It shows us man, his apostasy, his redemption by Christ, and his regeneration by the Holy Spirit. It expands before us promises exceeding great and precious, adapted to our necessities, trials, and afflictions, and sealed by Him whose resources are infinite and whose fidelity is immutable. It reveals to us other worlds, of joys eternal, and of woes that are endless. This book, too, is wonderful in its authority. It comes to us as the Word of God, professing his immediate inspiration, and addressing us in his awful name. Challenging our confidence, it holds us responsible for our faith in its testimony, and our obedience to its requirements. Yet it treats us as rational beings, supplying evidence for our conviction, and condemning unbelief only when inquiry is neglected or rational demonstration resisted. Hence, though sacred in its authority, imperative in its mandates, and making the issues of eternal life or death contingent on its acceptance, it claims no exemption from the criteria of the severest logic, and the ordeal of the most searching scrutiny. It only requires that our investigation be conducted with candour, and that the laws of evidence be applied with a genuine love of truth.

It would be impossible, within our limited space, to adduce the mass of evidence at our disposal in proof of the Divine origin and inspiration of the sacred book, for that alone would fill an ample volume: but there is one aspect of that evidence not so frequently adduced, but which may be advantageously reviewed; and that is, its unscathed *endurance* amid the severe and continuous ordeal to which it has been subjected, from the time of its earliest challenge to human inquiry. If the truth of any proposition depends upon its harmony with other known truths, it follows that if the Bible be true, it will harmonize

all other truths to which it is related; and that harmony become the more apparent in proportion to the advance- t of knowledge. The reverse of this would follow if the e were false. Ignorance begets credulity, and both foster r; but light and knowledge give truth fair play, and render foundations more apparent. Let ignorance be dispersed, truth will shine with a brighter lustre; let knowledge be sed, and the contradictions and absurdities of error will be- e the more manifest. What, then, should we say of that which, through all ages, has endured the severest tests of al inquiry, of individual experience, and violent opposition; whose evidence shines the brightest under the very meridian nowledge? Such, we affirm, is the characteristic evidence ne Bible.

—THE BIBLE, AS A REVELATION FROM GOD, HAS STOOD THE TEST OF LOGICAL INVESTIGATION.

Though some parts of the Sacred Volume have an earlier n than others, the essential and fundamental principles of atest parts are involved in the earliest revelations; and revelations carry us back to the creation of man, involv- germs of doctrine and embryotic truths which became de- ed in subsequent dispensations. Thus Revelation, in its tial germs, is coeval with the existence of man. There consequently been ample time for its investigation, and ample time there has been equal opportunity; for Revel- always courted, never shunned investigation: nay, it has investigation a duty, and has always afforded to men the facilities for its performance. Unlike the esoteric mys- of the heathen, it always sought the most open contact the popular mind; and its evidence, unlike the fabled mira- of Mahomet, always consisted of obvious facts, patent to vation and inquiry, and amenable to the axioms of logic. did Revelation seek the advantage of rooting itself into ar belief, in the regions of barbarism and ignorance, before llenged the faith of the intelligent and educated mind. he contrary, it always sought first the great centres of

population, where the human mind had attained the highest cultivation, for the promulgation of its teachings and the exhibition of its credentials. Thus it went to Chaldea, the most advanced of the Shemitic nations in civilization and knowledge, and selected Abraham, one of her most intelligent sons, as the living repository of its doctrines, the witness and dispenser of its truths. It went to Egypt in her palmy days, when her pyramids and her temples were rising, when her mighty Pharaohs were on the throne, and priests and magicians thronged her palaces. It went to Judea when David and Solomon were its monarchs, and the nation was in the zenith of its history. It went to Greece when she was the focus of learning and the fountain of knowledge to surrounding nations; when the sublime speculations of Plato were studied in the Academy, the dialectics of Aristotle were read in the Lyceum, and the schools of philosophy were crowded with rival sects. It went to Rome when she was the mistress of the world, when the Senate was renowned for its orators, and a galaxy of poets, historians, and philosophers encircled the imperial throne. And thus it went to other great cities of Asia and Europe, where the human mind had risen to maturity; and there it unrolled the scroll of its doctrines, and appealed to the facts of its evidence. Consequently, had Revelation been contradictory to the facts of history, the axioms of logic, and the known principles of truth, its contradiction must ages ago have become manifest, and its pretensions put to shame; and this result would have been accelerated by the open and uncompromising antagonism of Revelation to the passions, prejudices, and habits of mankind.

But has this disproof and discomfiture been the fate of Revelation? Have its narratives ever been falsified by authentic history? Never. Where genuine contemporaneous history speaks, it has ever been the ally and the witness of the Bible. Have the teachings of Revelation been found at any time in opposition to science? Never, except when Revelation was wronged by misinterpretation, or science herself was wronged by the substitution of conjecture for fact, and speculation for demonstration. It is not, indeed, the purport of Revelation to teach men science, but theology; and seldom, except incidentally, does it trench upon the province of science; yet, in

ry instance where a principle or a fact of philosophy is in-
ed in its teaching, it is in perfect harmony with the latest
overies of geology, astronomy, chemistry, and any other of
sciences. Sometimes it has anticipated, but never contradicted
genuine discoveries of science. Again we ask, Has the evi-
ce of Bible miracles been at any time overthrown, either by
counter-testimony of contemporaneous witnesses, or the
cal investigation of a subsequent age? Not in a single in-
ice. After all the elaborate subtleties of Hume, and the
d sophisms of Gibbon, the evidence of Scripture miracles
ains untouched. Have the prophecies of the Bible ever been
fied by events, or resolved into the lucky guesses of a shrewd
penetrating mind? Never. The fulfilments of prophecy are
striking, and the events foretold too numerous, too diversi-
, too remote, too minute in detail, and too much dependent
he contingencies of human volition, to be resolved into
e conjectures. Hundreds of predictions have been fulfilled
ady, others are fulfilling in the world around us now; and at
present time the voice of prophecy is more distinct, em-
tic, and voluminous than it has been in any preceding age
he history of our world. Thus, after the lapse of six or
n thousands of years since Revelation was first given, and
teen hundred years since its canon was closed, every de-
ment of Scriptural evidence retains its place, unshaken by
niry and undimmed by age.

Vigorous and determined efforts have, indeed, been made to
ermine the fabric of Revelation, but it stills stands erect,
bids defiance to every assailant. Men of acute and power-
intellect, of extensive erudition, and indomitable hate to the
le, have employed all their powers of reasoning and eloquence
hake its foundations—have ransacked history, science, and
aphysics to find some defect in the evidence, or some contra-
ion in the doctrines of Revelation; but they have signally
ed: and failing here, have had recourse to the fabulous
asties of Egypt, and the boasted chronology of China, to
icate some objections against the historical facts of the
le. But they have spent their strength for nought. Every
lel objection has been triumphantly answered again and
n. The weapons of assailants have been wrenched from
r nerveless grasp, and employed with terrible effect against

their owners; but Revelation has shone the brighter and the brighter for the ordeals through which it has passed.

We are often reminded that this is an age of education, of free inquiry and independent thought; when men have burst the restraints of a servile training, and will no longer bow to the dictum of authority, nor crouch before the prestige of antiquity; that now men will think and judge for themselves, and nothing can stand but what is based upon a solid foundation. Be it so. The friends of the Bible rejoice in this. But how happens it that in this age of general education, of free inquiry and independent thought, the Bible numbers more believers, and sways a more powerful influence over the human mind, than in any preceding era in the history of mankind? Other systems have paled before the increasing light: how is it that Revelation shines the brighter in its presence? Other fabrics have been torn from their foundations by the advancing tide of knowledge: how is it that Revelation retains its place? Epicurus framed a theory of atomic motion, to account for the origin of the universe without a God, but the ascertained law of gravitation has shivered the theory into atoms. Ptolemy reared a system of astronomy, which commanded mental homage for 1600 years, but it vanished before the discoveries and mathematical demonstrations of Kepler and Newton. The philosophy of Aristotle maintained a regal empire over modes of thought for near 2000 years, but it fell before the inductive philosophy of Bacon, and the mental analysis of Locke and his successors. Descartes' theory of ethereal vortices had its day, but it disappeared before the century of its birth had expired. Some time ago, extravagant theories of chronology, based upon the boasted dynasties of Egypt and China, were confidently put forth, but they have melted into idle myths before the Ithuriel touch of philosophic scrutiny. Not long since, a theory of self-making worlds from nebular matter was propounded, as a wonderful development of modern astronomy; but one night's exploration of the heavens through Lord Rosse's great telescope resolved the nebular matter into stars, and the beautiful theory vanished. Geography convicts the Koran as an ignorant imposture; the microscope exposes the folly of Brahmism; the light of the nineteenth century shows Buddhism to be a fable. These and other systems of false philosophy and heathenism are

ng dissipated by the light of science, and every one sees their end is near. Darkness does not more certainly re- before the sun, than false systems of philosophy and reli- n break up and dissolve before the piercing and overpower- light of truth. Yet no such catastrophe has threatened elation. Particular interpretations foisted on the Divine rd by human ignorance, and isolated texts damaged by nscription or misconstruction, have been corrected; but Re- tion itself, in its substantial fulness and integrity, retains place. Its historic facts, its doctrines, its miracles, its prophe- , its holy mandates, and its consoling promises, rest on a rock diamant, as stable as when they were first given. How is it , amid so many wrecks of human systems, Revelation re- ns unmoved, that no discoveries in science shake its found- ns, no facts in history falsify its records, no changes in the es of thought supersede its instructions? Here it stands movable amidst departed and departing theories. It lived re they were born; it survives now they are gone. Hoary n antiquity, it retains all its freshness and stability, and re- ns in our midst the guide of the wise, the beacon of the shing, and the light of the universe. Time has only served iscover the breadth and immutability of its foundations.

If the Bible is in harmony with truth, it will harmonize with f.—The harmony of the Bible with external truth is not e marvellous than its internal harmony with itself. Had it n the product of one mind, or even of several minds acting edly and contemporaneously, with a preconceived plan and pose, then we might regard its harmony as only an ordinary ct. But when we remember that its authors are about fifty- in number, living, for the most part, in different and dis- ages, many being separated from others by intervals of five dred, twelve hundred, and even fifteen hundred years, the mony becomes marvellous and inexplicable on the common ciples of reasoning. During those centuries the modes of ght and religion with other men had changed vastly; yet writers of the Bible perfectly agree. During those periods ires rose and fell; rival systems of philosophy struggled, ended, and supplanted each other; yet these authors are in sentiment. Though the books contained in the Bible many, yet one system runs through the whole, from Genesis

to Revelation; one dispensation of mercy germinates, grows, and ripens. Nothing is isolated, detached, or independent; everything is connected, successively continuous, and all are united as a perfect whole. Yet the successive writers knew not this when they were writing; or if they knew what had preceded them, they had no idea of the writers who would follow them. Often they did not know even the meaning of their own predictions, and the germs of doctrine they propagated were so far in advance of their own knowledge as to be incomprehensible even to themselves; and yet each thus unconsciously contributes to the development of truth, and the completion of God's redeeming plan. The Abrahamic dispensation is the development of the Patriarchal; the Levitical is a further development of the Abrahamic; the Prophetical is again a brighter expansion of the Levitical; and the Christian dispensation is the development and fulfilment of them all. Christ is the grand centre and theme, the beginning, middle, and end of the whole. We successively see the promise of the Seed of the woman converge into the Seed of Abraham, the Shiloh of Judah, and the Son of David; and finally, all are fulfilled in the Incarnate Son of God, the Immanuel, the Saviour of the world. In Genesis, we see man expelled from Paradise; four thousand years after, in the book of Revelation, we see him re-enter; and the shining symbol at the gate of Eden finally fills heaven with its eternal splendour. The history, the biography, the poetry, the proverbs, the prophecies, the Gospel narratives, and the Epistles, all contribute to the development of one sublime conception and purpose, the glory of God in the redemption of man; and the writers of the sacred volume, however diversified in talent, education, and natural idiosyncrasies, and however remote from each other in age or locality, are led successively to build up into perfect harmony and consolidated unity the wondrous system of Revelation, with its facts, doctrines, ethics, and profound development of things human and divine, leaving all other productions at an infinite distance, and astounding the world by its wisdom, harmony, and majesty. Is this a human device? Is there anything like it in any other volume? Is there any conception of it found in any human system? Can we ourselves conceive it as possible to result from accident or mere human device? Indeed, we cannot. The very instinct

our reason pronounces it to be impossible. What Rousseau
d of the Gospel narratives is substantially applicable to the
ole volume of Scripture. It is far more inconceivable, even
a Deist, that a number of persons, under such circumstances,
uld write such a book, than that God himself should be the
spirer of the whole. Its profound wisdom, its sublime dis-
eries, and its perfect harmony, proclaim it to be the product
one mind only, and that is the omniscient mind of God.

*Advancing knowledge always brightens the evidence of truth,
l exposes the contradictions and absurdities of error.*

If, therefore, the Bible be true, its evidence ought to be
re conspicuous in proportion as all collateral and relative
aths become unfolded by discovery; and such is the case.
s evidence is continually accumulating, progressing, and
ightening as ages advance. Instead of being lost or obscured
descending to us from the dim periods of a remote anti-
ity, it emits a brighter radiance as centuries revolve.
stead of flourishing most in an age of ignorant wonder,
rejoices most in the light of science, and in the full
eridian of mental development. It reckons not upon favour
m indolent credulity, but anticipates the firmest confidence
d the warmest discipleship from calm and thoughtful in-
iry, from intelligent and candid scrutiny, aided by the light
history, learning, and research. The more light, the more
idence. Hence the nineteenth century is, of all others,
e most prolific in its contributions to Bible truth. Modern
scovery has given to Revelation advantages unknown in any
eceding age. We have, in our day, evidence more voluminous and convincing than that which shone around when the
ostles wrought their wonders in Palestine, or Moses and
aron stretched forth their mysterious rod before Pharaoh in
e land of Ham. Every adventurous traveller, every prying
tiquarian, every devotee to classic lore and Oriental re-
arch, brings some new contribution to illustrate or confirm
e sacred page. As science penetrates the arcana of Nature;
enterprise explores the mouldering ruins of antiquity, and
humes the colossal monuments of fallen greatness; as learn-
g ransacks the archives of literature and deciphers the mystic
mbols of Egypt, Behistun, Babylon, and Nineveh, the evidence
Bible truth accumulates with a rapidity, and shines with a

refulgence that startle Infidelity, and afford to the Christian ocular demonstration for his faith. While geology, chemistry, and astronomy are confounding Atheism by multiplying the evidences of an intelligent Creating Cause, ethnology, glottology, archæology, and topography are confronting Deism by publishing, as with a sunbeam, the verity and the Divinity of the Sacred Word. 'Lieutenant Lynch has floated down the Jordan and explored the Dead Sea, and shown from that blasted region and its bituminous waters physical confirmation of the great catastrophe that overthrew the cities of the plain. Robinson, Wilson, Bartlett, and Bonar have taken pleasure in the very dust and rubbish of Zion, and they come back declaring that the Bible is written on the very face of the Holy Land. Burckhardt, Laborde, and Hamilton have opened out the lost wonders of Petra in the desert of Idumea; its stones have cried aloud, and many a prediction of Jehovah's word is there legibly graven with a pen of iron on the rock for ever.' Formerly Scepticism was wont to ask with a sneer, Where is Nineveh, that great city? and Neologists had begun to resolve its very existence into a myth; but Providence sent Layard and Botta to uncover its vast foundations and unseal its hidden monuments; and now when its massive sculptures of three thousand years are exhumed, covered with inscriptions recording names, and dates, and facts which identify the Scripture narratives of Assyrian and Judean history, Scepticism blushes at her temerity, and seeks to hide her dishonoured head from the light that streams upon her. Tiglath-pileser, Esarhaddon, Sennacherib, and Nimrod come forth from the murky caverns of old Nineveh to rebuke the scoffer and bear witness to rejected truth, and the voice of Nebuchadnezzar, after a silence of two thousand years, is heard again amid the ruins of Babylon, to speak for Daniel and the Jewish historians and prophets. Volney did not hesitate to venture a confident expectation that so soon as the hieroglyphics of Egypt should be deciphered the authority of the Bible would have an end. Since then they have been greatly deciphered, yet the Bible remains secure. The French *savans* who accompanied Napoleon the First in his expedition to Egypt, boasted that they had realized Volney's anticipations, for the records of two temples, Dendera and Esneh, they affirmed, gave evidence of an antiquity

tending to 17,000 years. Loud and exultant was the yell infidel triumph, for now it was evident, said they, that the ble was a myth. Hasty decision! vain triumph! When ampollion went to Egypt, he brought his penetrating genius l competent scholarship to the scrutiny of these said roglyphics, when, lo! he discovered in them the names of man emperors, thus proving them to have no earlier date in the Christian era. Again Infidelity was made to blush, l genuine learning showed that Revelation still securely ted on its ancient foundations. Indeed, it is now admitted competent scholars that the chronology of Egypt, like that China, when purged of fabulous admixture, reaches no ther back than the extended chronology of the Septuagint riptures. 'Hidden in the sands of Egyptian deserts, some God's chosen witnesses eluded human research in times st; but now, when the Bible is translated into about 170 gues, and diffused over the earth, and fresh confirmations timely, behold, there is a resurrection of those witnesses, l from sphinx-guarded sepulchres old Pharaohs totter into art, and testify how true were the narratives which Moses ote more than three thousand years ago.' *

Men of adverse creeds and professions, Pagans, Mahometans, ws, and infidels (employed by Providence, though they ow it not), are accumulating facts, and bearing sometimes unconscious, and sometimes a reluctant, testimony to the vinity of the sacred oracles. The apostate Julian, by his d but impotent efforts to falsify the Gospel, proved the re forcibly its truth, vitality, and power; and thus it has en in every subsequent age. An insidious Gibbon unwitgly builds up the temple he would fain destroy. A florid lney proves the verbal fulfilment of the prophecies he seeks undermine; and utters, unconsciously to himself, many a ral response to the very words of the living oracles. The del and profligate Rousseau records one of the most quent testimonies that ever was written to the character of rist, and to the superhuman histories of his life. Voltaire ed out while in health, 'Crush the wretch' (Jesus), but dly called upon Him for mercy when drawing near the

* Dr. Hamilton on the Bible. See my "Cosmogony of Genesis," and efutation of Bishop Colenso."

gates of death. Paine ridiculed the Bible as a fable during life, but a text cut him to the heart when about to die, and ere he expired he professed his belief in the Gospel he had denied. Lord Lyttelton and Gilbert West, both unbelievers, but of that numerous class who disbelieve without examination, engaged each to select a special fact for refutation. The former chose the Conversion of St Paul, the latter the Resurrection of Christ. They set to their task with vigour; but soon became startled by the force and clearness of the proofs that flashed upon their minds. The evidence of truth became overpowering, and each, unknown to the other, was compelled to reverse his purpose, and write an able treatise in defence of the truths he had hoped to undermine. These treatises still rank among our standard literature. Many an infidel who has sneered at the Bible at home, has, like John Newton and H. Townley, bowed to its authority abroad. Sometimes, as the sceptic has wandered amid the solitudes of deserted temples and dilapidated walls, gazing on their massive grandeur, deciphering their mystic symbols, and perceiving their wonderful coincidence with sacred truth, he has felt his infidelity give way to overpowering conviction, and reverently uncovering his head, has exclaimed, 'Truly the Bible is the word of God, and Jesus is the Saviour of men.' 'In my youth,' said Caviglia, when Lord Lindsay met him in the East, 'I read Jean Jacques and Diderot, and believed myself a philosopher. I came to Egypt, and its monuments and the Scriptures have converted me.' A type here of multitudes of candid minds who have found the augmenting light too bright to be resisted, and the force of truth too powerful to be overcome.

What do these facts argue? If the evidence of the Bible brightens with the light of science—if its proofs multiply with the accumulation of facts—if the ruins and the histories of ancient nations, and the discoveries of modern ones, serve but to confirm and illustrate its records, and overthrow every opposing theory, there is but one conclusion to which reason can come, and that conclusion is, That the Bible is true; and being true, it must endure in the future as it has in the past. It flourishes while other systems fade. Amid the splendours of the nineteenth century it holds a higher place than it did in the first. It has survived the effort and the hate of a

›usand foes; it has seen their systems come and go like the ›xing and the waning moon; and it shall outlive them all. shall flourish and triumph when the last of them is dead, l their memory lies mouldering in the dust, despised and dden under foot by an enlightened and a regenerated world. ›en let education and science continue to advance. Let the ›logist dig deep into the earth's old strata, and decipher ›ry lamina in the lithographic records of ancient time; let › chemist ply his laboratory and continue his process of ›lysis and synthesis, extending his discoveries into the pro›rties of matter; let the astronomer pursue his valuable ›coveries into suns and systems; let him sweep the midnight ›avens with his gigantic tube, and penetrate deeper and deeper ›o space, resolving the filmy nebulæ into brilliant constella›ns; let the historian, the antiquarian, the glottologist, and › physiologist continue their researches into the past and the ›sent; and the Bible has nothing to fear. The friends of › Bible are the friends of science, and hail its advancement; ›y are the friends of education, and expend their time, their ›perty, and influence in its promotion; and they tremble ›t for the ark of Revelation. Knowledge is the friend of ›th, and the Bible is the friend of both. The works of God ›d the Word of God must eternally agree, and whatever is ›e in the history or philosophy of man cannot contradict the ›ords and revelations of God.

II.—THE BIBLE HAS STOOD THE TEST OF EXPERIENCE.

The Bible presents not merely a system of doctrines for our ›lief, or of ethics for our conduct, but a *Divine remedy* for our ›ral malady, and a supply for our spiritual necessities. It ›us appeals to our experience as well as to our reason. The ›ivine remedy here propounded for us comes with open pro›ssions of its efficacy and power. While describing with in›itive accuracy the wants and woes of which our nature is ›nscious, it professes to transform the human character, and bless the human existence with personal happiness. It ›escribes a renovation of heart, a change in the dispositions, ›ections, and moral principles of the soul, combined with the

inspiration of a new class of emotions, enjoyments, and hopes, as the portion of those who cordially receive its truths. It sets forth the specific means by which this transformation and happiness may be introduced into our experience; it connects the end with the means, the blessings promised with the conditions prescribed. It openly proclaims to us that genuine repentance of sin, and a reliance on Christ, shall be followed by certain definite and experimental results—such as a peaceful conscience, a sense of the Divine favour, fellowship with God, and a joyous hope of heaven, together with the practical sentiments of supreme love to God and universal benevolence to man, not excepting even our enemies and persecutors. There is no theorizing here. All these are experimental blessings, and blessings promised with a clearness and a fulness that render mistake impossible—promised, too, by the oath of God. These blessings, in their substantial essence, are to be introduced to our consciousness, to be actually enjoyed by all who receive the Gospel by faith. Seeing, then, that these blessings are promised in the Bible, they must be realized, if the Bible be true; and thus their realization becomes an additional evidence of its truth. In this case the evidence lies not in human reason merely, but in human consciousness; and faith itself becomes converted into experience, or rather adds experience to its testimony. Here, then, is another class of evidence, and one the most potent of all, the most accessible of all; for, as it depends not on extensive erudition, or keen analysis, or elaborate argumentation, but on experience, it is equally adapted to men of every degree of mental calibre and culture—as well to the horny-handed labourer, as to the refined scholar; to the untaught peasant, as to the learned philosopher. But who does not see that while experience is the best evidence of truth, it is the most fatal antagonist to the pretensions of falsehood? If, then, the Bible were false, the test of experience must speedily destroy all its claims to our belief. For if the Bible were false, it could not fulfil its own promises; and if not able to fulfil its promises, the evidence of its falsehood would become manifest to our experience; and thus every one who tried its truth would himself become a witness of its falsehood. It must be clear to every one, that had the Bible been false it could not have survived the experience of a single generation.

t has it stood the test of experience? Yes, for six or seven
usand years; from the sainted Abel, who realized its power
after the first promise of a Saviour, down to the latest
nitent who this day trusted in Christ, and found peace with
d. It has myriads of witnesses now living on the earth, it
had millions in ages past, receding through every period
generation; and among them are astounding prodigies of
transforming power and almighty efficacy. Some, once the
st, have become the holiest of mankind—profligates and
lots, proud blasphemers and sanguinary persecutors, have
ome transformed into the brightest ornaments and the
st advocates of its truth. Among the ancients I see a
dy Manasseh, a persecuting Saul of Tarsus, a polluted
gdalen, and a dying thief; and among the moderns I see a
fane Bunyan, a profligate Buchanan, a blaspheming John
wton, who ranked among the brightest lights of their day;
some of the most notorious infidels of the present age, after
ndering far and long in the dark labyrinths of infidelity, seek-
rest but finding none, have at last returned to the truths
y have deserted, and herein found peace, joy, and salvation.
l 'such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are
ctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus,
by the Spirit of our God.'

Respecting this experimental testimony, let me introduce
remarkable witnesses, and the more remarkable because
h came from the dark shades of infidelity, and one from a
rading profligacy. John Newton, whose infidelity, profanity,
hardened contempt of sacred things, brought upon him the
mous cognomen of 'the African blasphemer,' was led, during
eriod of thoughtfulness, to ask himself respecting the Bible,
'hat, after all, if it should be true?' He was induced se-
usly to examine the New Testament, when meeting with a
sage in Luke xi. 13, which promised the gift of the Holy Spirit
them that ask for it, he was led to reason thus—'If this
k be true, the promise in this passage must be true likewise.
d has here engaged to give his Spirit to those who ask. I
st therefore pray for it; and if it is of God, he will make
d his own word. My purposes were strengthened from
n vii. 17, where it is said, "If any man will do his will, he
ll know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether

I speak of myself."' This was the turning-point in Newton's eventful history. He applied this experimental test; he began to apply it even when he did not as yet believe in the Gospel. But he tried it, and he found it true. He was assisted by the promised Spirit. The evidence brightened as he examined the Word and prayed; unbelief gave way; he became saved, and was transformed from a raving profligate blasphemer into a true believer—a holy, happy, experimental witness of the truth of the Gospel; and after living fifty-five years a bright monument of its saving power, he expired, happy in the triumphant hope of its eternal blessedness.

The other example is that of the Rev. Henry Townley, who says, 'I have travelled the road of unbelief, and know its dismal scenery, and the gloomy goal to which it leads. When a young man, I read Hume's Essays; I associated with infidels; I imbibed their sentiments, and neglected religious observances of every kind. My worldly calling was respectable and lucrative, and I bore a fair character among my kindred, my clients, and my neighbours. All things outwardly were prosperous and smiling, when suddenly the symptoms of a wasting disorder, which I thought in about three months would end my life, appeared. Death did then indeed appear to me as an unwelcome visitor clothed in crape. My conscience told me that I had not acted ingenuously with a book professing to be the Word of God; that I had not given it that thorough and candid investigation which it deserved. I resolved to spend the remnant of my days in the earnest pursuit of truth. I determined that if that book, upon due examination, should answer to its appellation, I would act in harmony with its dictates; if otherwise, I would lay it aside and meet death without it in the best way I could. I read, and pondered what I read. I searched, and made inquiry. My health soon returned; but I continued my investigation of the Scriptures, I think I may say, without a day's intermission, for a year. The result was, that all my doubts and objections were cleared away, and I became a believer. I began then, I trust, in real earnest, to try to please my Maker and my Saviour, and to make my fellow-creatures happy; and from that time to this, a period of above forty years, I have lived a conscientious life, waking in the morning, and lying down at night, with a peaceful breast, and a

p full of immortality.' In this instance, we see unbelief associated with ignorance. Mr Townley, like Lyttleton, st, and hundreds of other sceptics, had not examined the ptures. But investigation led to conviction; conviction was wed by repentance and faith; and repentance and faith e followed by an experimental consciousness of Gospel sings. The conditions being fulfilled, the promises were mplished, and the sceptic became a *conscious witness* of the n, and that consciousness never failed him in after-life.

These, then, are specimens, out of myriads like them, of the pel's convincing evidence and transforming power, on hearts most hostile to its teachings, the most fortified against its ence. Nor is it of any moment in what age or nation the may be applied. Greek or Jew, barbarian or Scythian, or free, the sable African, the fair-skinned European, the bitants of the tropics or of the polar regions, the denizens ne world before the Flood and our own contemporaries in present day—all who fulfil its conditions realize its bless-: all experience the same renovation of heart, and the same itance of its consolations and joys, varied only by that itutional temperament which gives diversity to unity, which s the countenance, but speaks forth the same common nity. The laws of light are not more perfectly adapted e optical structure of the eye, nor the vital properties of tmosphere to support combustion and sustain life, than is ospel, unfolded in the Holy Scriptures, adapted to illumin-ne understanding, renovate the nature, and bless the ex-e of mankind; nor are the operations of physical causes certain in their results than is the Gospel in effecting the formation it professes to produce, and in imparting the dness which it promises to bestow.

ere, then, is a great moral fact—the result of a given and that cause the Gospel, and of nothing but the Go-No other cause can produce it. Other causes may reform e, revolutionize the opinions and habits of men; but only ause can regenerate the heart, and superadd that state of spiritual blessedness which is promised in the Gospel. e cannot give the elements of spiritual religion; philoso-nnot give them; superstition cannot impart them; poetry usic cannot excite them. Nature, philosophy, and super-

stition never even conceived them. False religions cannot produce them; they may counterfeit Scriptural truths, and mimic Scriptural rituals; but no counterfeits of Biblical truths, and no mimicry of Biblical rituals, can produce the elements of experimental religion. They flow only from the principles of the Bible, and result only from faith in its testimony. Their realization in the depraved heart of man is the fulfilment of Bible promises, and their fulfilment is the evidence of Bible truth; and the truth of the Bible is the vouchment of its divinity, as the oracle of God. Experimental religion flows from the application of Bible truth by the Holy Spirit to the human heart. It is therefore God's own seal affixed to his own truth; and in every instance of conversion, the Divine signature is renewed; and the Bible challenges all men to apply this experimental test of its truth.

Nor does it avail to plead that the experience of spiritual religion is but partially prevalent in the world, and is sometimes falsified by its professors. The truths of the Bible do not profess to operate where they are not received, nor to work out their results where their conditions are not performed. In chemical and experimental philosophy, it is only when specified conditions are fulfilled that certain philosophic results can take place. In the absence of the conditions there is also the absence of the results. This is an unalterable law, and Nature could not be true were it otherwise. Men do not see when they shut their eyes, nor derive nourishment from food, unless they eat and drink. We do not blame Nature for this, nor call in question its efficacy. We rather censure the folly of those who expect effects without their causes. So of experimental religion; the effects cannot be separate from their cause. The blessings of the Bible are promised *conditionally*. When the conditions are fulfilled, the promises are fulfilled; and they are always fulfilled when the conditions are performed—fulfilled in all ages, and among all people, and without any exception. This fulfilment is an evidence that the promises are true; and being true, their origin is of God. Thus the Bible proves its Divine paternity.

III.—THE BIBLE HAS ENDURED, UNINJURED, THE MOST VIOLENT AND DETERMINED OPPOSITION.

It is a humiliating fact that the volume sent to bless man- l should find not a welcome, but the deepest hatred, and most determined opposition. In every age Revelation has to encounter foes. Looking back on its history, and ecially since its canon was completed, it would seem as if h had leagued itself with hell to extirpate revealed truth amongst men. Its foes, not content with employing the have often wielded the sword, and tried to effect by legal tments and physical violence what argument failed to ac- plish. Potentates have proclaimed their edicts, tyrants lighted up their pyres, and mercenary legions have shed s of human blood to destroy the Bible and its believers. urderous Antiochus sought to extirpate the Jewish Scrip- s; he destroyed all he could find, and declared death nst those who refused to deliver up the copies in their ession; but the fidelity of the Jews and the providence of frustrated his designs. Diocletian, impelled by the same l rage, not only shed torrents of blood in persecuting the stians, but issued an imperial edict that all their Scrip- s should be burnt; yet the courage of the saints, who e rather to part with life than the sacred treasure of God's d, defeated his infernal purpose; and that sanguinary t, at last weary in the fruitless strife, was compelled to ss that the more he laboured to blot out the name of st, the more legible it became; and that the more he la- ed to eradicate the principles of the Bible, the deeper they k their roots, and the higher they rose. After ten inary persecutions, during which almost every Roman nce was dyed with the blood of saints, the Church existed, he Bible that sustained the martyrs' faith and supplied with consolation remained unimpaired. The tyrant who l extirpate a nation could not blot out a truth.

Papal Rome, in her turn, followed in the wake of Pagan e, and tried the full weight of her power to extinguish Christianity. Popery, indeed, is little better than Pa- m baptized, and the Sacred Book whence we draw our

faith and the pabulum of our spiritual life, denounces Popery as the seven-headed monster, and as the scarlet whore, drunk with the blood of saints. Doubtless there are, and always have been during the period of Rome's darkest apostasy, some who loved the Bible and exemplified its truths; but these were God's hidden ones, who wept in secret over abominations they could not remove. But as a Church, represented by popes, cardinals, and prelates, and judged of by her public acts and documents, Rome has been a most relentless foe to that Sacred Volume which openly exposes her character, unveils her abominations, and foretells her doom. She has undermined its authority by rival traditions, corrupted its doctrines by human inventions, and forbidden its use by bloody decrees. She has thundered her anathemas, dug deep her dungeons, reared high her scaffolds, and lighted up Christendom with martyr-fires, to put down the use of the Bible and neutralize its truths. Yet still the Bible lived. Her black Bartholomews, her *autos da fé*, and her public rejoicings at the wholesale murder of innocent men, evinced her hatred to the Bible; yet she could not suppress its reading nor exterminate its truths. The blood-stained valleys of Piedmont, the gloomy dungeons of her inquisitions, the gleaming sabres of her fierce dragoons, and the fires of Smithfield, Gloucester, Oxford, and Derby are imperishable reminiscences at once of her dreadful ire against the truth and her impotent efforts to put it down. For amid the rage and fury of her murderous opposition, the Bible continued to make its way, increasing the number of its readers, and multiplying its copies. It was the Bible that made Wycliffe a Reformer, that rekindled forgotten truths in the souls of Jerome and Huss, and flashed conviction in the mind of the intrepid monk of Erfurt, whose powerful voice shook the Vatican, and roused the slumbering Churches of Germany to life and freedom. It was the Bible that freed Britannia from the yoke of Rome, and inflicted the deadly wound on the head of the apocalyptic beast. When the Bible Society arose, Popery cursed its pestilent labours, and pronounced the Protestant Bible to be 'the Bible of the Devil:' but despite her anathemas, that God-like institution pursued its mission, and since Rome's curse was uttered has sent forth ninety millions of copies of the Sacred Volume, in languages or

ects which make it accessible to one-half the population of
globe. That Bible is now circulating rapidly in Italy
lf, and working out the freedom of the people and the de-
iction of the Papal power.

Atheism, in its turn, tried the hand of power to crush the
alled superstition of the Bible. Amid the convulsions
ch shook France about the close of the last century, Athe-
clutched the falling sceptre, and mounted the vacant
ne. When once seated in power, she showed what she
ld do for mankind. She promised them liberty, but forged
them chains; she promised them a Paradise, but created
Aceldama; she promised a model republic, but made a
demonium. She proscribed Christianity, abolished the
bath, declared the Bible a fable, and death an eternal sleep.
son was her goddess, and an infamous woman adored as its
ge; licentiousness was her freedom, spoliation her morality,
murder an innocent expedient of State. Atheism, once
roned, laid bare her malignant bosom, unsheathed her
ible sword, and the Reign of Terror began. Order fled
re anarchy, the nation became deluged with blood, and
nce, trembling before the grim spectre she had invoked,
n saw that instead of destroying the Bible she had well
n destroyed herself. It was enough. The creed of despair
shown its true character, and surrounding nations feared
n they saw despised truth avenged upon its adversaries.
w wonderful that the infamous woman who had been
red as the Goddess of Reason should herself become
rived of reason for twenty long years of her miserable
and finally die in a pauper lunatic asylum! How still
e wonderful that the short reign of infidelity should be just
time when God woke up his Churches to evangelize the
ons by missionary enterprise; that the moment when man's
udest defiance was hurled against God's Word should be
moment when the angel of benevolence should be seen fly-
with outstretched pinions through the midst of heaven, to
ense that Word of God to all the nations of the earth!
so it was; and the results are before us. Little more
sixty years have passed away since that struggle com-
ced, and it is estimated that there are now in the world
less than 2600 missionaries, 7500 assistants, 4000 mission

churches, more than 250,000 converts, 3000 missionary schools, 250,000 children and adults belonging to them, 90,000,000 of Bibles scattered over the earth in languages spoken by 600,000,000 people, or full one-half of the earth's population! These facts show on which side victory is found.

Verily there is a God that ruleth in the kingdoms of the earth; and as surely as he gave his Word to men, shall his providence watch over it, and his Almighty arm protect it. His enemies may as well attempt to pluck the sun from the solar system, yea, to subvert God's eternal throne, as to destroy his Holy Word, or to overturn one of its declarations. Amidst the horrors of persecution, the ravages of war, the wreck of nations, and the convulsions which during six thousand years have destroyed many, and changed *all* human things, and poured successive tides of desolation upon our earth, Revelation has been preserved, and it shall be preserved for ever. It is hardly possible to conceive that any opposition in the future can be more violent or more powerful than in the past; but though it should be, and be increased tenfold, still the Bible shall live, indestructible through all the future, as it has been in the past. The past is prophetic of the future. As it has endured the ordeal of logic, science, history, and experience, so shall it endure the hand of power, however mighty or violent that power may be. It has yet a purpose to fulfil, and it shall fulfil it. It is adapted to that purpose, and it cannot fail. Revelation is a light streaming from the throne of God upon our dark world. Where its beams shine, the night of Pagan darkness retires, the spectres of ancient superstition depart, and errors which had enslaved the mind for ages melt away; there Truth erects her throne, and bestows the blessings of her reign; she breaks the iron sceptres of despotism, throws open wide the putrid dungeons of oppression, removes the fetters of the slave, awakes the torpid powers of the mind, erects the prone savage into a man, transforms the man into a saint, and fits him to dwell with the angels of God. Welcome, thrice welcome the blessed day, when God shall speak to the slumbering nations, 'Arise and shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee'—when the Bible shall take the place of every ancient error, every false sentiment, every corrupt principle—when the charter of the

d's privileges shall be unrolled to the view of the re-ned universe, and all men shall rejoice in its blessings. t day shall arrive, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken A hundred predictions declare it, and the oath of God con-s it; for, 'As I live, saith the Lord, the whole earth shall illed with my glory.'

CHAPTER II.

HE HOLY SCRIPTURES—THEIR INFALLIBLE INSPIRATION.

PIRATION is a supernatural gift. The inspiration we claim the Bible is such Divine influence or agency upon the ds of the sacred writers as rendered them the penmen of Holy Ghost; so that through them God speaks to man-d, revealing truths which reason could never discover, dicting events which reason could never foresee, an-ncing promises which none but God can fulfil, enforcing es of imperative obligation, because required by his own nority, and narrating events for the illustration of his cha-er, and the instruction of his people; or, as Theodore and gory have observed, 'The tongues and hands of the sacred ers are to be regarded as the instruments employed by the y Spirit to make known and record his will.'

It is unnecessary to prove that mankind stood in need of a ine revelation; for, as Dr Paley well observes, 'We never t with any serious persons who think that, even under the istian dispensation, we have too much light, or any degree ssurance which is superfluous.' All candid minds familiar n the history of our race, will at once admit that, without evelation from heaven, mankind could have obtained no r and sufficient knowledge of God, no certainty of a future e of existence, no infallible code of morals, no adequate ives to virtue and holiness, no satisfactory determination pecting the will of our Maker, or the mode of securing his our. All these subjects are clearly beyond the reach of nan philosophy; for, in those regions where the mind of n has received the highest culture, its interminable aberra-

tions and contradictions have served but to show its own incompetency, demonstrating the truth of the Apostle's words, 'The world by wisdom knew not God.'

Such being the fact, it is not unreasonable to suppose that God would grant a revelation to his ignorant and erring creatures; that he who brought man into existence, and is infinitely interested in his welfare, would unfold to him a special discovery of his will; that he who has given to matter its laws, and to our animal nature its instincts, would also give to our intellectual and moral nature a knowledge of such truths as are necessary to be known, and of such duties as are necessary to be performed, in order to promote his own glory, and secure our present and eternal happiness. It is related of Socrates, the celebrated Athenian philosopher, that he uttered an expectation that God would at some period send a Divine messenger, to dispel the bewildering mists of error, and shed upon the mind the light of truth and certainty. Such messengers have been sent, and the light of truth and salvation has been given by the inspiration of God.

If it be reasonable to suppose that God would give his creatures a revelation of his will, it is equally reasonable to suppose that he would cause that revelation to be committed to writing—this being essential to its preservation and permanence. Without this, the revelation, however clear when first given, must ultimately perish, or a perpetual series of miracles be wrought for its preservation. For, if handed down by tradition and made dependent upon memory alone, it would gradually become obscured; and, in the process of ages, be so changed, adulterated, and disfigured, as to bear but a remote resemblance to the character it had when first announced from heaven. But by committing the revelation to writing this calamity is prevented, and the necessity of a perpetual miracle superseded. The truths once discovered to us by God are transmitted, unimpaired, from one generation to another, and are capable of being accurately translated into every tongue spoken by the family of man. The revealed will of God *has been* thus committed to writing, and the collection of the Divine records is called *The Scriptures*, that is to say, THE WRITINGS, and, by way of eminence, and in contradistinction from all merely human compositions, 'The Holy Scriptures.'

Our immediate object is to maintain the *plenary inspiration* he sacred writers, and to show that *all* the books of the l and New Testament are the authentic oracles of God. tions most repugnant to the infallible authority of the sacred tings have been propagated, not only by avowed infidels, by some who assume the Christian name. Socinian critics general, and the so-called Rationalist divines, adopt a princi- at variance with the Divine authority and inspiration of the red volume, maintaining that Revelation is but a brighten- of our mental vision, or an elevation of our reason, like which kindles the genius of the poet, or gives penetration power to the philosopher. The absurdity of this notion is equalled by its profanity; but it so evidently carries its refutation as to prove innocuous to all reasonable minds. nspiration be only elevated 'reason,' how is it that pro- ts foretold events with circumstantial exactness, some ral hundreds, and others several thousands, of years before r accomplishment? If these predictions be the effects of on, they are profane and blasphemous in their pretensions, use announced in the name of God, under the profession pecial revelation. If inspiration be resolved into 'reason,' is it that such doctrines as the resurrection of the body, other sublime truths, are discovered to us, which unin- ed men of the strongest minds never conjectured? How that the Apostle should say 'that eye hath not seen, nor heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the gs which God hath prepared for them that love him,' ex- by Revelation? If such marvellous discoveries be the uction of reason, how is it that the 'mental penetration' ssary for their discovery should be excluded from all men pt a few Jews, called prophets and apostles? Such speci- s of reasoning evince a state of mind not very compatible 'common sense,' and mankind must forfeit their claim common sense' before such raving can pass for rational ment.

Moreover, if the Sacred Scriptures be the production of ated reason,' in what respect do they differ from the ngs of Plato, Cicero, Seneca, and other sages, both in nt and modern times? Not in authority, for many heathen s and philosophers had reason and sagacity in a superior

degree. If inspiration be reduced to reason, we have no advantage from Christianity—no more certainty in our inquiries after truth, no more authority in moral duties, than are furnished in the productions of heathen writers. We may adopt as our teacher Plato or Paul, Seneca or John, Socrates or Jesus; or, rejecting them all, may sketch out our own system of truth and ethics; or, like the sceptics of the ancient Grecian school, may hold all things in doubt—amid the numerous opposing forms and contradictory theories in which reason assumes to have found the *truth*, determine that there is nothing true; or, if true, that it is impossible to be ascertained by man. But the theory in question, if fully carried out to its logical results, conducts us to consequences beyond what some of its advocates are prepared to admit. It virtually *denies* the revelation which God has given to man, and is equivalent to an open avowal of infidelity; it is, in its nature and tendency, as fraught with Deism as it is with heresy. The ground on which the Bible sustains its high authority is its Divine and infallible inspiration. If it be a Divinely inspired book, it is worthy of our highest confidence; it comes to us with the authority of God. If it be not an inspired book, it has *no* authority; it has not even the authority of an honest human composition. It is not worthy of being held in equal respect with the productions of Greek and Roman sages, but it is an impious forgery, and is to be rejected with the Koran of Mahomet, the Zendavesta of the Persian, the Shasters of the Indian, and the fables of heathen mythology. A system, the direct tendency of which is thus to extinguish the light of Christianity, overspread the world with heathen darkness, and plunge the minds of men into universal uncertainty and scepticism, cannot be too strongly repudiated by all sincere Christians. The system may ally itself with plausible pretensions to benevolence and freedom, but it is not the less to be abhorred on this account, for such pretensions are no uncommon allies with the most destructive delusions. However specious its professions, it is but Antichrist in disguise, which, under the pretext of reforming Christianity, is undermining its foundations. Like the treacherous Judas, it betrays the Redeemer with a kiss.

It is this pernicious theory we propose to overthrow, by

ıblishing the opposite proposition, that is, '*The infallible* ›*iration and Divine authority of the sacred records.*' In the ›eding chapter we have proved the authority of the sacred ıme. Our task now is to show that the writings of the and New Testament profess this inspiration, and that all the ks included in the sacred canon are genuine and authentic.

We maintain, then, in the FIRST PLACE, *that the sacred writings ›ess to be Divinely inspired.*

In reference to the *Old Testament* this is most distinctly and ›hatically maintained in numerous passages. The New tament abounds with assertions to this effect; and as our ıediate object in this argument is to adduce the testimony or *›essions* of the sacred writers, of course we are at liberty to eal to the New Testament in favour of the more ancient ›rds. The Apostle Paul, addressing Timothy, thus maintains Divine inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures:—'But con- e thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been red of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that ı a child thou hast known THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, which are to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in ist Jesus. ALL SCRIPTURE *is* GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD, *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for ruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be per- throughly furnished unto all good works.'—2 Tim. iii. –17. This testimony is decisive as to two facts. First, in the Apostle's days there was a collection of sacred re- s called '*The Holy Scriptures;*' and secondly, that *every* k contained in that collection was recognized as Divinely ired. If the Apostle had spoken of Scripture in an in- nite manner, an unfair critic might plausibly have contended nothing more than a loose and general application of Paul's ›tion; but his language is so clear and definite as to pre- e an exception being taken against any book of the Old ament. He first speaks of the whole volume of the sacred rds, and designates that volume '*The Holy Scriptures,*' then expressly affirms the inspiration of the whole. Were e not another passage of kindred import, this itself is ıdantly sufficient to show in what character the whole vol- of the Old Testament was regarded by the Apostle, and he early Christian Church.

But, besides this assertion of Paul, we have special evidence in reference to the inspiration, or Divine authority, of *each* sacred book of the Jewish Scriptures. Almost every inspired writer expressly affirms that he speaks or writes by the special instruction and authority of God. The books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy were written by Moses; and in numerous passages we have his Divine inspiration plainly asserted. It is there stated that God appeared to him, showed him his glory, conversed with him for forty days on the mount, revealed to him the pattern of all the Jewish economy, and wrote the law on tables of stone. Hundreds of times in the Pentateuch is the inspiration of Moses stated in the repetition of the phrase—'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying,' &c. The inspiration of Joshua is asserted in the same manner in instances too numerous to repeat. We have only to open any part of the writings of these holy men, and we meet with the plainest declarations that they were inspired by the Holy Ghost.

The books of Judges, Ruth, and the first twenty-four chapters of the First Book of Samuel, are by the Jewish Church ascribed to Samuel, whose inspiration as a prophet is clearly maintained. The remaining chapters in the First Book of Samuel, and the whole of the Second Book of Samuel, the ancient Jewish Church ascribed to Gad and Nathan, both prophets inspired by the Almighty, and authorized to proclaim and record his truth. Indeed, it is declared in 1 Chron. xxix. 29. 'Now the acts of David, first and last, behold, they are written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and of Gad the seer.'

The two books of Kings are ascribed by the Jews to the prophet Jeremiah. It was usual with the prophets to write the history of their own times. Some collected the writings of their predecessors, and digested them into one continuous history; and no one who concedes to them the gift of prophecy can deny their qualification to furnish the Church with a true narrative of events. Besides, these histories themselves contain numerous prophecies, which only those who are inspired of God could foretell.

The two books of Chronicles are attributed by the Hebrews to Ezra, as well as the instructive book which bears the name

that pious and devoted man. Ezra is set forth as 'a scribe the words of the commandments of the LORD, and of his utes to Israel.' 'The hand of the Lord his God was upon ,' and he wrote, spoke, and acted under Divine authority, a vii. 10, 11, 28. As Bishop Warburton remarks—'Ezra te, and we may say acted, under the inspiration of the Most gh, amid the last blaze, indeed, yet in the full lustre of ex- ng prophecy.' The memory of Ezra has always been held he greatest reverence by the Jews, who consider him second to Moses. The book of Nehemiah was written by himself, indeed it is for the most part written in the first person. nemiah wrote and acted in concert with Ezra; his book is eed a narrative of contemporaneous events, and is a record Divine authority.

The book of Esther is confined to the history of the Jews ing the reign of Ahasuerus, the Persian monarch, and was bably extracted by Ezra from the Persian Chronicles or onal records, which were kept with great exactness. This account for the words 'Lord' and 'God' not occurring , and for no express mention being made of the providence God, as in a mere civil chronicle of the Persian nation such ssions might very rationally be expected. This, however, s not make against its being canonical, for, if its original er was not inspired, its *compiler* was, and thus the record *adopted* by Divine authority as a part of sacred Scripture n to us of God. In this book the state of the Jews is ated, and the providence of God over his people in a time persecution and distress is very strikingly displayed—a suf- nt reason with God for causing this portion of history to elected and preserved.

The book of Job is supposed to be the most ancient record existence, as it was probably written by Job himself, who d between the time of Abraham and Moses. Job was in- ed by God, and the book is recognized as such, not only ts always having had a place in the sacred canon, but also by ages in the book itself, and by repeated quotations and rences by Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Paul, and James.

That precious memorial of piety, poetry, and prophecy, the k of Psalms, was composed chiefly by David; but several ms are ascribed to Moses, Asaph, and other holy and in-

spired men. The inspiration or Divine authority of no sacred book is better attested than the book of Psalms. Many of the psalms are prophetical, and are continually appealed to by our Lord and the Apostles as of Divine authority. As one example, take the words of our Lord: 'For David himself said BY THE HOLY GHOST, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.'—Mark xii. 36.

That invaluable treasure of practical wisdom, the book of Proverbs, bears the name of Solomon for its author so far as the thirtieth chapter. Up to the twenty-fifth chapter the arrangement was made by himself; but from thence to the thirtieth, the collection was made by the men of Hezekiah after the death of Solomon. The thirtieth chapter is ascribed to Agur, and the last chapter is entitled 'The words of king Lemuel,' which some regard as another name for Solomon himself. That Solomon was inspired is evident from sacred history (see 1 Kings iii., iv., v., vi., ix.). And the Divine authority of the book of Proverbs is further manifested from the numerous quotations inserted by the New Testament writers. Compare Prov. xxv. 21, 22, Rom. xii. 20; Prov. iii. 11, Heb. xii. 5, &c. The book of Ecclesiastes is also ascribed to Solomon, and has always had a place in the sacred canon. The inspiration of Canticles, or the Song of Solomon, has been disputed by some modern writers, but they are confronted by the indisputable facts—that the book is ascribed to an inspired writer; that it is contained in the Septuagint version, formed 280 years before Christ; that it was therefore a part of the sacred volume sanctioned by our Lord and his Apostles as 'the Scriptures,' the 'Holy Scriptures, given by inspiration of God.' Moreover, it is contained in the Chaldee Paraphrases, and in all the versions, both of the Jewish and the Christian Church. True, there may be a difficulty in rightly explaining and applying the allegorical imagery of this ancient book, but it was, no doubt, understood to the edification of the ancient Church; and to many spiritually-minded believers of the present day is fraught with edification and comfort.

We now come to the prophets, who were, as St Augustine observes, 'the philosophers, divines, instructors, and guides of the Hebrews in virtue and piety.' We need not dwell upon them separately. They were all inspired by the Holy Ghost

reprove sin, reveal Divine truth, and predict important
nts. They are the authors of the sacred books under their
pective names, and they all profess to have uttered and
tten their prophetic announcements under the immediate
uence of the Holy Spirit. Their declarations and predic-
ns are usually introduced by the solemn asseveration of
TUS SAITH THE LORD,' or 'THUS SAITH THE LORD OF HOSTS,'
'THE WORD OF THE LORD CAME UNTO THE PROPHET, SAYING,'
Therefore to deny their Divine inspiration is to charge
n with hypocrisy.

We have thus taken a rapid view of all the books of the Old
tament Scriptures, and proved that they assume to be in-
ed, and claim our confidence in them as such. The result
ur inquiry affords evidence, respecting *each* sacred book, of
truth which the Apostle asserts respecting *all*—namely,
they are 'given by inspiration of God.'

We proceed now to speak of the Divine inspiration of the
v Testament writings, and our remarks in reference to the
iration of this portion of the sacred records may be com-
ed under three general heads:—FIRST, That inspiration
as necessary for the writers of the New Testament, as it
for the authors of the Old Testament. SECONDLY, That this
iration was promised to them by Christ. And, THIRDLY,
have historical proof that the inspiration promised was
arted.

FIRST, *We remark that the inspiration of the Holy Ghost
as necessary for the writings of the New Testament as it was
the Old.* The blessed Redeemer came into the world for
poses unspeakably more important than any other Divine
senger. He came to make known the will of God, to re-
his truth, to fulfil ancient predictions, to announce new
s, to present an example of perfect obedience, and to pro-
the world's salvation by his sacrificial death. Now, to
petuate the benefits of his mission through all ages, and ac-
plish the purposes of his mercy throughout the world, it
necessary that the leading transactions of his life, and the
rines, prophecies, and instructions of his ministry, should be
rded, and that with unerring truth and correctness. But
as not fit that such a record should be intrusted to unin-
ed man. Fidelity and talent might suffice for the historian

of civil affairs, but the unerring guidance of the Spirit was required for those who had to record the discourses, the prophecies, the doctrines, the promises of Christ, and the great purposes of his life and death. Who could feel secure in resting his eternal interests upon a record written from man's unaided memory, many years after Christ's discourses had been delivered? Who could ascertain that the Saviour's doctrines were truly stated, or his promises unerringly recorded? A lapse of memory in the writer might distort a promise, pervert a prophecy, misstate a duty, or obscure and adulterate a most important truth, and thus lead the Church into fatal error through all ages. Therefore, to secure the record from error, and stamp it with authority, and thus inspire our confidence in its statements, it was absolutely necessary that the Spirit which filled the soul of the Saviour should guide the pen of the evangelists.

Moreover, inspiration was necessary for the *further* revelation and exposition of Divine truth. Notwithstanding the great light which the teachings of our blessed Lord shed upon the world, the revelation of his truth was not completed by his *personal* ministry. The full expansion of some truths, the announcement of additional prophecies, and the development of further purposes, were reserved for a future time, and we find these furnished to us in the Epistles. But this further revelation could not be accomplished without inspiration, and if inspiration was required, it was consonant with Divine wisdom and goodness to bestow it; and hence we have to observe—

Secondly, *That the inspiration of the Spirit was in the fullest manner promised for this purpose.* Our Lord's gracious promises are thus expressed: 'And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.' 'These things have I said unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.' 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak

imself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.'—John 16, 17, 25, 26; xvi. 12—14. These promises of our blessed d are very important, and their meaning should be carefully nded to. They show, first, as we have already stated, that revelation of Divine truth was not completed by the per- l ministry of our Lord; and secondly, that a dispensation HE SPIRIT was to be given for its completion.

.t is worthy of notice, too, that the promise of Christ dis- lly specifies the several purposes for which the Holy Spirit ld be given, and they are such as we have already named. purpose was to 'bring all things to their remembrance soever Christ had said unto them'—thus qualifying them rite an infallible record of his teachings, predictions, pro-, example, and his death for the salvation of men. Such ord we have in the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles. her purpose was to *unfold and expand the truth*: 'He shall you all things, and guide you into all truth;' thus qualify- em to expound and illustrate the truths which in his own try had been but briefly stated. In conformity with this, pistles present the doctrines of Christ in their *expanded eveloped form*. It is here that Christ is especially glorified e Spirit, in its fully exhibiting the great purposes of his as a sacrifice for sin. The Spirit takes of the things of t and shows them unto us, and thus completes the dis- es of redeeming love. Another object was to predict events: 'He shall show you things to come.' In the f the Apostles, and in most of the Epistles, but especially book of Revelation, there are prophecies of many im- t events, some of which extend through all future ages, o the end of time. Thus, while there is an exact corre- nce betwixt the purposes for which inspiration was re- and the promises of Christ in reference to the nature of irit's influence, so the character of the New Testament gs exactly corresponds with both.

IRDLY, *we remark, this promise of inspiration was fulfilled.* matter of history. Our Lord commanded the Apostles y at Jerusalem until they should be 'endued with power n high'—until they should receive 'the gift of the Holy

Ghost.' They obeyed his command, and sought the fulfilment of his promise by prayer. In an upper room 'they continued with one accord in prayer and supplication; and when the day of Pentecost was fully come, there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.'—Acts ii. 1—4. Thus the promise of inspiration was accomplished, and the Apostles and holy men chosen of God were qualified to proclaim his truth, and to write those sacred books which were necessary to complete the canon of Holy Scripture. Can evidence more conclusive and satisfactory be required by any reasonable mind? Is any fact, ancient or modern, more clearly attested and authenticated than the inspiration of these holy men? Had we only our Lord's promise of inspiration on which to rely, it should of itself suffice, as his character guarantees the fulfilment of his word; but when, in addition to the promise, we have before us the history of its fulfilment, infidelity is deprived of every subterfuge or excuse. The fulfilment of this promise, too, gives the same authority to the Epistles as to the Gospels; to the instructions of the Apostles as to the teachings of Christ; for they were both spoken and recorded under the same Spirit, and the writings of the Apostles are to be regarded as the inspired expositions of the Saviour's doctrine.

Although these arguments demonstrate the inspiration of the New Testament writings *in general*, it may be necessary to answer a few objections, which some have urged against the inspiration of certain portions of these writings.

It may be said, although infallible inspiration were given to all the Apostles, yet two of the New Testament writers, Mark and Luke, were *not* apostles. To this we reply—Notwithstanding Mark and Luke were not of the Twelve Apostles, they were inspired men. The gift of the Holy Ghost was not confined to the Apostles, but shed its miraculous influence upon multitudes of disciples in the primitive age of the Church. Both Mark and Luke were evangelists, and while their writings bear internal evidence of their inspiration, in the earliest period

the Church they were received as of Divine authority. The dence of this is so clear that ecclesiastical writers have ded down to us a tradition, that the Gospel of Mark had sanction of Peter, and the writings of Luke the approval St Paul.

Against the inspiration of the Epistle to the Hebrews it been alleged that it is anonymous. But this objection has veight, for several books of the Old Testament have not authors' names affixed to them, and yet their inspiration is rted by the authority of Christ and his Apostles. Although name of Paul is not affixed to the Epistle to the Hebrews, as regarded by the most ancient writers as written by St l, and some ancient versions have his name prefixed. In-, the evidence which identifies it as his production is clear satisfactory. Many of its phrases and terms of expression a striking resemblance to the writings which bear this tle's name. This Epistle was written from Italy, and the r apparently speaks of himself as then a prisoner there cting deliverance, and entreats the prayers of the Church this might speedily be effected. 'Pray for us: for we we have a good conscience, in all things willing to live stly. But I beseech you the rather to do this, that I may stored to you the sooner.' 'They of Italy salute you'—18, 19, 24. Now, Paul, we know, was a prisoner at Rome wo years, and from thence wrote several epistles to the ches; but there is no record of any other apostle writing es while imprisoned at Rome. The writer also makes ionate mention of Timothy: 'Know ye that our brother thy is set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I ee you'—xiii. 23. This language, harmonizing as it does the ardent affection of Paul for Timothy, with their fre- and intimate connection in ministerial labours, and with ell-known fact that Timothy was with the Apostle at , raises the evidence to a moral certainty that Paul was riter of this epistle. Moreover, this epistle was written HEBREWS, or converted Jews; and it is worthy of notice St Peter, writing to the *same people*, makes mention of ul's epistle to them. He says, 'And account that the uffering of our Lord is salvation: even as our beloved ER PAUL also according to the wisdom given unto him

hath written unto you.' This appears to be a distinct recognition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and of St Paul as the author of it. In conformity with this fact, the matter of this Epistle proves its inspiration. It not only harmonizes with the whole volume of Revelation, but illustrates and explains many subjects which, without it, would have remained comparatively obscure, and it speaks with an authority which none but an inspired writer can claim.

'The Epistle to the Hebrews,' Dr Adam Clarke justly observes, 'is by far the most important and useful of all the apostolical writings; all the doctrines of the Gospel are in it embodied, illustrated, and enforced, in a manner the most lucid, by references and examples the most striking and illustrious, and by arguments the most cogent and convincing. It is an *epitome* of all the dispensations of God to man, from the foundation of the world to the advent of Christ. It is not only the sum of the Gospel, but the sum and completion of the Law, on which it is also a most beautiful and luminous comment. *Without* this the law of Moses had never been fully understood, nor God's design in giving it. *With* this, all is clear and plain, and the ways of God with man rendered consistent and harmonious. The Apostle appears to have taken a portion of one of his own epistles for his text—"Christ is the END OF THE LAW for RIGHTEOUSNESS to them that BELIEVE," and has most amply and impressively demonstrated his proposition. All the rites, and ceremonies, and sacrifices of the Mosaic institution are shown to have had Christ for their *object* and *end*, and to have had neither intention nor meaning but in reference to *Him;* yea, as a *system* to be without *substance*, as a *law* to be without *reason*, and its *enactments* to be both *impossible* and *absurd*, if taken out of this reference and connection. Never were *premises* more clearly stated; never was an argument handled in a more masterly manner; and never was a conclusion more legitimately and satisfactorily brought forth. The *matter* is everywhere the most interesting; the manner is throughout the most engaging; and the language is most beautifully adapted to the whole, everywhere appropriate, always nervous and energetic, dignified as is the subject, pure and elegant as that of the most accomplished Grecian orators, and harmonious and diversified as the music of the spheres. So many are the *beauties*,

great the *excellency*, so instructive the *matter*, so pleasing the *ner*, and so exceedingly interesting the *whole*, that the work be read a hundred times over without perceiving anything *sameness*, and with new and increased information at each lling. The latter is an excellency which belongs to the whole elation of God; but to no part of it in such a peculiar and er-eminent manner as to the Epistle to the Hebrews.' This ortant portion of the sacred writings has been received as onical in every age of the Church.

The Book of Revelation.—The inspiration of this book has n denied by some, but there is not clearer evidence respect- the inspiration of any part of the New Testament than re is concerning this portion of the sacred writings. It bears name of an inspired apostle, and it everywhere professes to communication from God. 'The Revelation of Jesus Christ, ch God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things ch must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it his angel unto his servant John: who bare record of the d of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all gs that he saw.' As a collateral evidence of its genuine-, it refers to the Apostle's exile in the isle of Patmos, as period when and the scene where the revelations were com-icated. 'I John, who also am your brother and companion ribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and he testimony of Jesus Christ. I was in the Spirit on the d's day,' &c. Now, the Apostle's banishment to this island he reign of Domitian is an event attested by ecclesiastical ory. Moreover, the book of Revelation contains numerous ses and terms which correspond exactly with St John's style riting, as will appear to any one who attentively compares th his other productions. It accurately describes the con- n of several principal Churches in Asia Minor existing at time. It speaks with an authority which none but God assume, and utters rebukes, commands, admonitions, de- iations, predictions, and promises which none but God has prerogative to proclaim. While these characteristics show it *claims* inspiration, the clear fulfilment of many of its hecies manifests that its claims are irrefragable. We have to read the prophetic description of the destiny of the

Seven Churches, and compare it with their present condition, and we have ocular demonstration for our faith. Many other predictions in this sacred book have been fulfilled, others are being now fulfilled around us; and these are proofs that the mind which indited them was God, and the hand that recorded them was directed by that Spirit which Christ had promised to his Apostles to '*show them things to come.*' Thus it appears that the WHOLE VOLUME of the New Testament, as well as the Old, asserts its claim to Divine inspiration.

The inspiration of the whole Scriptures being thus established, there are two inquiries which may naturally suggest themselves. FIRST, *What is the kind or degree of inspiration vouchsafed to the sacred penmen?* And SECONDLY, *Does this inspiration apply to every sentence or passage recorded by them?*

In reference to the FIRST question, we reply, there are two kinds of inspiration—the inspiration of infallible guidance, and the inspiration of suggestion and revelation. Now, such inspiration in its nature and degree was imparted to the sacred penmen as was necessary to preserve them from all error in their teachings, and render their statements infallibly true. But to secure this result, the nature and degree of Divine influence imparted would differ, according to the nature of the various subjects on which they wrote.

For example, in reference to history, when authentic documents were accessible, or the knowledge of events had been handed down by tradition, there is no necessity to suppose such miraculous influence imparted as would supersede human industry in the collection of facts. This is not God's mode of operating. He delights to employ the natural powers of the human mind, and to render ordinary means available as far as possible for the accomplishment of his purposes. Therefore, in the case supposed, it was sufficient if the Holy Spirit guided the sacred historian in the selection and compilation of materials already existing, supplying others by suggestion, and infallibly preserving the writer from lapses of memory and error of judgment; thus rendering the narrative not only faithful but perfectly true, and adapted to present such views of God and his proceedings as were best fitted to benefit man and promote his salvation.

A higher degree of Divine influence, however, was requisite

the *revelation* of doctrines, prophecies, promises, and re-
ous duties. Such subjects being far above the reach of
an discovery, a Divine *inflatus* was imparted to the mind of
sacred writer, actually inspiring *new* thoughts, sentiments,
truths, and infallibly guiding both his tongue and pen in
r public announcement to mankind.

In our Lord's promise of the Holy Ghost we see these seve-
kinds and degrees of inspiration are clearly set forth. The
it was to *aid the memory*, to testify of Christ, and to lead
all truth—influences necessary for infallibly *recording*
s. He was likewise to *reveal truth*, and show them things
ome. Both these kinds of influence were sometimes im-
ed to the same writer in different portions of his writings,
pleased God frequently to blend prophecy with history,
the revelation of Divine truth with the narrative of earthly
ts. But whether in recording facts or revealing truth, the
it so effectually presided as to make the work his own.

*It appears evident from the Holy Scriptures that the sacred
ers composed their works under so plenary and immediate an in-
ce of the Holy Spirit, that God may be said to speak through
to mankind.* We appeal to the Scriptures themselves. Do
es and the prophets of the Old Testament write? Their
nciations of truth are commonly introduced by the solemn
aration, 'THUS SAITH THE LORD.' Does our Lord refer to
d? He recognizes the voice of God in the words of the
mist—'For David by the Holy Ghost spake.' Does the
stle Paul refer to Isaiah? He says, 'Well SPAKE THE
Y GHOST by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying,
heart of this people is waxed gross,' &c. Does he refer
e Old Testament writers in general? He represents God
peaking by them: 'God, who at sundry times and in
s manners SPAKE in time past unto the fathers by the pro-
s, hath in these last days SPOKEN UNTO US by his Son.'
the agent was God, the instrument was man—it was
OVAH who spake! In the same manner he speaks to us
gh the New Testament writers. Do the Apostles speak
rite respecting the common salvation? 'They speak as
PIRIT gives them utterance,' and they assure us that their
spel is not after man, for they neither received it from man,
were they taught it, but by THE REVELATON OF JESUS

CHRIST.' In writing to the Churches respecting future events, the Apostle declares, 'Now the SPIRIT SPEAKETH EXPRESSLY, that some shall depart from the faith,' &c. These are only specimens of a numerous class of passages clearly representing the language of inspiration as the voice of GOD; and, in accordance with this fact, the ordinary name which inspiration itself has assigned to the sacred volume is, 'THE WORD OF GOD'—'THE ORACLES OF GOD.'

Indeed, so especially has the Holy Spirit influenced the minds of his inspired servants, and so carefully has he guarded his truth, in reference to the *revelation* of *doctrines*, *prophecies*, and *promises*, that he has dictated not only the sentiments, but the very words in which they are expressed.

This appears from the fact that in respect to many prophecies the inspired writers themselves did not fully comprehend their meaning; and in such cases it is clear the predictions could not have been recorded without verbal inspiration. Daniel, at the conclusion of one of his prophecies, states, 'And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end.'—Daniel xii. 8, 9. The Apostle Peter intimates that the prophets in general did not understand the full import of their own predictions respecting Christ and the Gospel dispensation; for they 'who prophesied of the grace that should come, inquired and searched diligently; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.' Thus they had but dim perceptions of the latter-day glory; and without an inspiration controlling the very words of prophecy, they could not have penned the testimony of the Spirit. The prophecy was evidently given in *words* which the Holy Ghost taught, and the revelation itself was a subject of study and inquiry to the prophets as well as to their readers. Indeed, in other instances, where the truth revealed was clearly understood, the superintendence and guidance of the Spirit evidently directed the words of the author. St Peter maintains this in reference to the Old Testament, when he declares that 'the prophecy came not of old time by the will of man, but holy men of God SPAKE as they were moved by the Holy

ost ; ' and St Paul maintains this in reference to the writers of New Testament, when he states, respecting the truths of the spel, ' God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit : for the rit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For at man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of n which is in him ? even so the things of God knoweth no n, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the rit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we ht know the things that are freely given to us of God. ich things also we speak, not in the WORDS which *man's wis- teacheth*, but WHICH THE HOLY GHOST TEACHETH.' Such sages clearly show that the inspiration of prophets and apo- s had respect to the *words* in which the truth is presented to minds ; and such a control was required to preserve the renly treasure from being damaged by being deposited arthen vessels. While this verbal inspiration has guarded truth from human obscuration and admixture, it has not oped the writers of their characteristic peculiarity of style. saving grace, though it transforms the soul into the moral ness of God, does not obliterate that variety in the tempera- t and disposition of our nature which distinguishes one from another, so neither does inspiration reduce the sacred ers to an unvaried monotony of style. Each had his natural ell as his spiritual gift from God, and the latter does not roy, but elevates, enriches, and employs the other.

In reference to the SECOND INQUIRY—' *Does this inspiration y to every sentence or phrase recorded by the sacred writers ?*' e reply, without hesitation, Undoubtedly it does, to every ence where truth is taught, and where God is represented peaking to man, or where an inspired writer is speaking in 's name. A few phrases there are introduced of prophets postles which are of a personal or incidental nature, and h have little or no connection with the truths of their d message. For example, when St Paul speaks doubtfully whether he had baptized any others at Corinth besides pus, Gaius, and the household of Stephanus ; or when he ests Timothy to bring with him the cloke and parchments ad left at Troas, we conceive no inspiration necessary for incidental, personal, and casual observations ; though even it may be the Holy Spirit guided Paul to insert these

matters for some practical purpose, or to show us by such incidental allusions the minuter phases of the Apostle's life. Another small class of exceptions exists in those instances where a sacred writer tells us that he speaks not by Divine authority, and distinguishes his own *personal* judgment from the commandments of God. For example: when the Apostle, having no inspired direction to give in reply to certain prudential questions, simply gives his own views as a private Christian, stating, 'But this I speak by permission, and not of commandment.' 'But to the rest speak I, not the Lord.' 'Now concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord: yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful'—1 Cor vii. 6, 12, 25. From these instances we see that so fully are the Holy Scriptures a copy of the mind of God, a tablet inscribed by his own Spirit, that the sacred penmen themselves have not ventured to blend their own views, or mix up their own statements, without giving special notice of the fact; thus evidently implying that, in *all* cases where this distinction is not observed, their injunctions and teachings are expressly by the authority of God. Every doctrine revealed, every promise made, every truth asserted, every prediction announced, and every fact narrated for the edification of the Church, was penned under the inspiration and guiding influence of the Holy Spirit.

The sacred writings being thus inspired, it follows that they are *infallible* in all their teachings and decisions, and of Divine authority in all their requirements. We are aware that men of weak or perverse minds have maintained the contrary, but their notion is disproved by the whole course of argument we have pursued, and by every scripture we have quoted. Indeed, the notion refutes itself, if only the moral honesty of the sacred writers be admitted; for they *assert* their inspiration, and every passage which asserts their inspiration implies the infallibility of their teachings. If the Old Testament writers announced their testimony 'as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' and the New Testament writers 'as the Spirit gave them utterance,' then it is God that speaks to us in the Holy Scriptures, as we have already shown. But what God declares must be true. To maintain that his teachings are mixed with error, is to charge God either with ignorance or a design

mpose upon his creatures, which is absurd and blasphemous. ascribe any error to the *sacred writers* does not mend the ument. It shifts the difficulty, but does not remove the in-sistency; for the inspired writers do not speak in their own ne, but in the name of God. If they *did* speak under in-ration, their word is true, infallibly true; if they did *not*, r honesty is impeached, and their testimony is false as well erroneous, deceitful as well as fallible. The fallibility and piration of the Scripture testimony are terms which cannot id together—they involve two contradictory propositions, ch mutually destroy each other. If fallible, they are *un*in-ed and *false;* if inspired, they are *infallible*. Consent only he external evidences of religion; admit only that the ers of the Scriptures were honest men, and the conclusion resistible: the records of the Holy Scriptures are unmixed infallible truth.

But we are referred to the failings and sins of certain in-d men as proofs of their fallibility. This, however, is a ism, in which either the authors of it are ignorantly en-led themselves, or by which they intend to entangle others. our affirmative proposition is, not that the inspired writers e either infallible or impeccable as *men*, but that the *Scrip-s* written by them are infallibly true. The sacred writers e not the originators of the truths contained in the Scrip-s, but simply the medium through which they were com-icated. *God* was the author; *they* were the instruments h he employed to convey to mankind the knowledge of elf. This is the representation of the case everywhere n in the Scriptures. It is true the apostles and prophets not inspired at all times—every moment of their ex-ce; but always when they revealed the will of God, and e known his truth to man. It is true that they sometimes l and sinned, but they never teach their errors for the truth od, nor plead inspiration as an apology for sin. Their s and their sins were their own; their inspiration was of

The former are confessed and reprehended; the latter vested with Divine authority: against the former we are oned and admonished; the teachings of the latter are en-d by the high authority of God. Their inspiration as ne teachers did not take away their peccability as men;

personally they were liable to fall, and as free agents were accountable to God; but officially, as the organs of Divine communications from God, they were so unerringly guided, directed, and controlled, that their teachings and revelations are pure, unmixed, infallible, and eternal truth—the truth of God.

In conformity with this established truth—the infallibility of the Divine records—we find they are constantly appealed to as the final standard to decide all religious questions.

Our Lord appealed to them in all his controversies with the Jews: 'Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.' When he reasoned with the sorrowful disciples about the purposes of his mission, he put honour upon his written word, as the test of truth. 'For beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.' Again, he said unto his disciples, 'These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures.'—Luke xxiv. The apostles constantly appealed to the Scriptures in like manner, and their decision was made final in all religious controversies. They reasoned with the Jews out of the Scriptures, 'opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead.' The Scriptures are spoken of under those appellations which distinguish them from all human and fallible productions, and proclaim their Divine authority. They are called the Scriptures of TRUTH, 'THE HOLY SCRIPTURES,' 'The WORD OF GOD,' 'THE LIVELY ORACLES,' 'THE ORACLES OF GOD,' and, if any man speak, it is commanded, 'let him speak as the ORACLES OF GOD.'

If it be said that the passages now quoted apply to the Old Testament, we admit it; and the inevitable conclusion is, that the writings of the Old Testament are infallibly true. That which God has made the final standard of appeal must itself be true, and those writings which are called the oracles of God must be true, if God himself be true. But the same character is claimed for the New Testament writings. The

spensation of the new covenant is not less important than e old. It is greater in glory and blessing, and its records e equally authenticated by the Spirit. It abounds, as we ve shown, with new discoveries, promises, and predictions, d for its completion the Spirit was promised and given. The cords of apostles are invested with the same authority as ose of the prophets. Hence the Church is said to be 'built on the foundation of apostles and prophets.'—Eph. ii. 20. ow, this connection of apostles and prophets implies an equal thority for the teachings of both. In accordance with this, e writings of the apostles were commanded to be read in the urches, where none but the books which the Jews believed be inspired were required to be read.—Col. iv. 16. St Peter arges the Christians 'to be mindful of the words which were oken before by the holy prophets, and of THE COMMANDMENT US THE APOSTLES;" implying that both were of Divine author-y. He, moreover, classes the writings of Paul with the THER Scriptures,' which designing men 'wrest and pervert their own destruction.'—2 Peter iii. 2, 16. St Paul chal-nges the same Divine authority, and designates his written structions the *commandments of the Lord;* he says, 'If any an think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknow-dge that the things which I write unto you are the COMMAND-ENTS OF THE LORD.'—1 Cor. xiv. 37. These passages render e evidence complete, that in inspiration and authority the ew Testament writings stand on equal ground with the ore ancient records of the former dispensation. As St ugustine forcibly observes, '*Illud literis consignarunt apos-li tanquam membra, quod dictante Christo capite cognoverunt.*' What Christ, as the Head, dictated, the apostles, as members f his body, have recorded.

So expressly has God authenticated the *whole* sacred volume his own, and so solemnly has he guarded his truth against e practice of imposture, the admixture of human errors, nd the intrusions of uninspired composition, that the most vful maledictions are denounced against all false prophets and achers—mere pretenders to inspiration—against all spurious ritings, against all who wrest and distort the Holy Scriptures, nd against all who presume to add unto or detract from his ure and holy Word. In the very conclusion of the sacred

canon, in sealing up the vision and prophecy, this solemn and remarkable admonition is recorded: 'I testify to every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen.'—Rev. xxii. 18, 19, 20.

The Divine Being having granted to man a written revelation of his will and the way of salvation, intended to be a light to the world through *all* generations, it is rational to suppose that his providence would be engaged to preserve it; for the same reason which operated with God to give a revelation to mankind must present a motive to perpetuate it. We cannot conceive it possible that a revelation completed, as ours is, by the mission of the Saviour and the descent of the Holy Ghost, and designed, as its own declarations prove, for all future ages, should be permitted to perish, or become materially injured. This would frustrate Jehovah's design in giving it, and render his condescending goodness ineffectual, except to a few in a particular age of the world. The wisdom, the mercy, and the faithfulness of God forbid such a result; the undertaking of Christ forbids it; and the express declarations of prophecy, which announce the enlightenment of the world by the truth of the Holy Scriptures, and proclaim that the Word of the Lord endureth for ever, equally forbid it. The fact that the Scriptures have been given by God for the purposes stated involves the certainty that they shall never be permitted to perish from the earth. We have them now unimpaired in the languages in which they were first written, though ages have passed since those languages ceased to be spoken. The Spirit which gave them lives in them; and teaching immortality to man, they are immortal themselves. 'The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of the Lord abideth for ever.' 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but his Word shall not pass away.'

Does the unlettered Christian sometimes honestly but anxiously inquire, What tangible evidence have we by which it can be demonstrated that the present volume, called the Scriptures,

indeed genuine—a faithful copy of the original autographs of e inspired men? We reply, The same kind of external evi- nce by which we obtain an assurance of any event that tran- ired in former ages, only with tenfold greater proof of its rtainty than we have of most transactions in past history. ow are we acquainted with the literature and events of ancient nes? How is it that we are convinced we have the genuine oductions of Homer, Xenophon, Tacitus, Virgil, and other cient writers? It is not by the transmission of authentic cuments, copies, and translations of original works, the genu- eness of which is sustained by a stream of collateral evidence, acing the question beyond rational doubt? The Holy Scrip- res challenge this proof, independently of other evidence rived from prophecy, miracles, and internal excellence. The cts which exhibit this proof are of the same kind in sacred as profane literature; but as Isaac Taylor, an accomplished holar and writer, remarks in his admirable work on 'The ansmission of Ancient Manuscripts:' 'The integrity of the cords of the Christian faith is substantiated by evidence in a afold proportion more various, copious, and conclusive than at which can be adduced in support of any other ancient itings; and if only the justice of the case were regarded, the thenticity of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures would never controverted till the entire body of classical literature had en proved to be spurious.'

In reference to the Jewish Scriptures, the testimony of sephus, of Philo, and the ancient Jewish Church in general, e Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint version, the Chaldee raphrases, and the fact that almost every book of the Old stament is quoted or referred to in the New, present, at this r, an array of evidence, clearly demonstrating that the books y held sacred by us are the same as that collection used in days of Christ and the apostles, and by them designated e Holy Scriptures.' Moreover, the Jews, from whose fore- hers we received them, acknowledge to this hour the same l Testament writings as ourselves, and in their exile wander- s exhibit in every country a monumental evidence both of truth of our religion, and the integrity of the ancient iptures.* Then, in reference to both the Old and New

* 'Ut Judæi, tanquam capsarii nostri libros nostros circumferrent ut cum

Testaments, their translation, during the first ages of the Christian era, into various languages, especially the Syriac and Latin, effected probably either during the lifetime of the apostles or shortly after — the public reading of them in all Christian churches — the concurrent testimony of the Fathers, whose voluminous writings abound with quotations from them, whose lives were devoted to their illustration, and sometimes laid down in their defence—the primitive catalogues of the inspired records, and the existence of rival sects, who multiplied copies of the Divine oracles to a great extent, and whose wakeful jealousies of each other must have prevented any collusion to corrupt the sacred text—these numerous and varied sources of evidence, accessible at this moment, combine to prove that we have now faithful transcripts of the books written by the inspired men.

We know what the sacred text is *now*, for we have innumerable copies of the Scriptures at hand; we know what it was a century ago, for we have numerous copies of that age, too; and we know what it has been through every preceding century, for we have copies now extant of every age up to the fourth century of the Christian era, and other sources of evidence carrying us higher still—up to the very time of the apostles, when the autographs were used by the churches; and all these witnesses, on examination, prove the identity of the Scriptures we use with those which prophets and apostles wrote. We know what writings are held sacred now, and what are not; and without difficulty we can distinguish the one from the other. In the present day we can easily distinguish the word of God from the ravings of Johanna Southcott, the spurious books of the Mormonites, and all modern pretences to inspiration; and we can easily distinguish it, too, from the homilies of the Church of England, the commentaries of learned men, and all human compositions: so could our forefathers of the last century, and so could those of each preceding century up to the apostolic times: the chain of connection and proof is unbroken and complete. In every age the evidence of God's holy word has been

Pagani non credunt, quæ nos de Christo prædicta fuisse dicimus, quasi a nobis essent conficta, mittamus eos ad inimicos fidei nostræ Judæos, qui libros nostros circumferunt in quibus eadem habentur, quæ nos prædicamus.'—AUGUST. *de Civ.* c. 46.

apparent, and that evidence can be read and searched at this day, proving that in each period of the Christian world, the Scriptures we receive have been received in general as the inspired word of God, and distinguished from all merely human compositions. Although the writings of good but uninspired men were read sometimes in the ancient churches, they were distinguished from the Scriptures, and called ecclesiastical, *not* Divine: they were as clearly understood to be distinct from the Scriptures as the homilies of the Church of England are from the Bible; and they were read, as St Jerome tells us, for edification, but not for authority in matters of faith. In the quotations and references made by the Fathers the same distinction is observed between the word of God and the productions of men. When spurious writings have been issued, the Church of God has detected and disowned them. If any sacred book has been doubted by one part of the ancient Church, it has been received by the other, where it was better known, and the evidence of its inspiration was more apparent. The Book of Revelation, apparently on account of its mystic character, was not unanimously received at one period, but it was received by the *earliest* Fathers of the Church, and subsequently, after the most thorough examination of its claims, its authority was fully established. This fact demonstrates the caution and vigilance of the Church in guarding the truth of God, and ought to establish our confidence the more firmly in the decisions which ultimately settled the canon of the sacred books; for no portion of Scripture is better authenticated than the Apocalypse. As a prophetic book its evidence accumulates and brightens with the lapse of ages, and this applies to other parts of the sacred oracles. While the evidence of some facts decays with age, like the falling and crumbling monuments reared to commemorate them, the testimony of Scripture increases and strengthens. Time rears new monuments to the truth of the Bible, and gives freshness and bold relief to every ancient inscription of its Divine authority.

One word in reference to the various readings in versions and manuscript copies of the original text. As Horne observes, 'by far the greatest number of various readings relate to trifles, many of which cannot be made apparent in a translation.' We have verbal variations in the different editions of our printed

Bibles, but they do not materially affect the sense, neither does one-hundredth part of the various readings in the original. Dr Kennicott devoted thirty years to the examination of Hebrew manuscripts, but states that he found no variation which in the smallest degree affected any article of faith or practice.' Many hundreds of Greek manuscripts of the New Testament have been rigidly examined, and the result of these labours proves that no general collusion has been attempted to corrupt the word of God, and fully establishes the purity of the sacred text beyond any production of antiquity. Its Divine Author has watched over its history, and handed down to us a faithful transcript of his revelations to mankind. This testimony is sustained by the most gifted and accomplished minds, whose whole lives have been devoted to the study of the Bible, and whose learned researches have extended through the wide circumference of sacred literature. The Holy Bible commands our faith, our veneration, and obedience, and it is worthy of them. As the immortal Locke observes, 'It has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter.' It is the instrument God employs to enlighten, to save, and bless our benighted and ruined world; and, next to the gift of Christ and the Holy Spirit, is the greatest boon he has conferred upon mankind.

Believers, 'read and revere the sacred page,' 'search the Scriptures,' make yourselves familiar with these blessed records of truth, of duty, and everlasting life. Infidels have sometimes been struck with their simplicity and grandeur—their purity and excellence; but the saints, in all ages, have admired and loved them. Like the devout Psalmist, meditate therein both day and night; and, like pious Lois and Eunice, train up your children in the knowledge of their truths. In your family, your closet, and on the way, let the Bible be your constant companion. If you have time to read no book but one, let it be the Book of God!

CHAPTER III.

THE HOLY TRINITY.

RIGHT views of God are essential to a true belief of the Gospel, and the Holy Scriptures alone are the source of authoritative and infallible teaching on this great subject; and seeing that God has made himself known to man in his Word, we would devoutly listen to his instructions. Let us first consider the important appellations assigned to God in the ordinance of Baptism, and in the commission to preach the Gospel.

In the great commission to preach the Gospel to every creature, God speaks of himself under a threefold designation, saying, 'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' If in any part of our Lord's teaching special care was requisite in the use of words, in order to give men right views of God, it was here: for here is a declaration of God's Name; here is an authoritative mandate to make this Name known to the whole world; and here is an injunction to perform a solemn ordinance in this Name, as one special means of publishing and perpetuating it among all mankind. This threefold Name, then, has no human origin; it is applied by our Lord himself to the Godhead, and applied by him as expressive of the Divine Nature; and because expressive of the Divine Nature, he commands it to be proclaimed to the whole world, as the Name by which the Deity should be acknowledged and worshipped by all mankind. To deny this Name is to deny the authority of Christ; to question its appropriateness is to question his wisdom; to withhold it from God is to rebel against the plainest injunction to make it known. Wherever the Gospel is preached, this threefold Name must be proclaimed as the Name of God; and wherever baptism is celebrated, it must be performed in this as the Name of Him whom we receive and acknowledge as our only God. The Gospel cannot be preached without its publication; for it is expressly specified as a part of the Gospel message. It stands out both as a first and fundamental proposition in the Gospel system. Other doctrines are doubtless in-

cluded in the Divine message; but this is not only included, it is *expressed*, and expressed because it is the basis of all other truths, and must, therefore, be made the first element in all evangelic teaching.

Such being the importance of this Threefold Name, it is satisfactory to know that the text which embodies it is admitted by men of all creeds to be authentic and genuine. Here there is no dispute, nor can there be even any diversity of opinion. The text expressing this Name is contained in all copies of the original Greek, ancient as well as modern, however high you ascend in antiquity. It is contained, also, in all the versions, ancient and modern; and the translation of this threefold Name of God in every version is the same. Nor, indeed, can a different translation be given; for the text consists of a few simple terms which admit of only one literal translation. This is so obvious, that no difference of which we are aware has ever been suggested, even by men of opposite creeds and opinions. Commentators, grammarians, theologians, and critics, though differing on some points wide as the poles are asunder, uniformly agree in the translation of this passage. Even in the Unitarian version of the New Testament, the Name of God as 'the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost,' is in this passage rendered precisely as it is in our own version. This unanimity as to the genuineness and the translation of this passage is of the highest importance; for it narrows the ground of controversy, and gives an undisputed standard of appeal. We have, therefore, only to surrender our understanding to the teachings of acknowledged authority, in order to obtain clear and correct views of God. To this infallible standard, then, we come, and placing ourselves before the sacred oracle, we reverently inquire, 'Who is the Christian's God, and what is his awful Name? Is he an absolute Unity, or a Duality, or a Trinity?' The text before us gives an answer, clear, decisive, and without the least ambiguity — 'He is the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.'

Here, then, three appellations are applied to God; not more, not less. Each Name is distinct and separate from the other, yet connected by the copulative conjunction '*and*.' We are sure these three appellations are appropriate; for they are applied to God by the Great Teacher and Saviour of mankind,

who came to show men who God is. But if these three distinct appellations are appropriate, constituting together the Name of the Ever Blessed God, they must be expressive of some distinctions in the Divine Nature. Yet in these distinctions there must, at the same time, be an essential union; for the three appellations constitute together but the Name of the One Living and True God. Guided by this important passage, and the general tenor of the Holy Scripture, we maintain that Jehovah, who is one in essence, has revealed himself to man as subsisting in a distinction of Three Persons, denominated Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We do not profess to define or explain precisely the *nature* of this distinction, because God has not revealed it. It is probable, indeed, that the terms of human language are inadequate to express it; and that our capacities in this life are too limited and feeble to receive it. 'We use the word 'person,' therefore, under some limitation—not to express the existence of three separate and independent beings, but to mark the fact of a real threefold distinction existing in the Godhead. In this sense the word 'person' has the sanction both of Holy Scripture and of a venerable ecclesiastical antiquity, being the translation of the word ὑπόστασις (*hypostasis*) as used by the Nicene Fathers, and by our own translators when they designate Christ the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person.—Heb. i. 3. The distinction in the persons of the Godhead is such, we believe, as implies distinct consciousness, combined with united and coequal participation of the Divine nature and attributes.

Here, however, we are met by three opposing sentiments, which it is our duty to examine and refute—the Unitarian, the Sabellian, and the Tritheistic.

The *Unitarian* theory embraces two classes of opinion, both denying the doctrine of the Trinity, and contending for the absolute Unity of God. The high Arian maintains that the being called the Son is the chief of God's works, even higher than the angels; but the Socinian regards him as only a mere man. As to the Holy Spirit, the Unitarian sentiment is vague and diversified. Sometimes he is regarded as an attribute of God, or an influence proceeding from him; and sometimes as only another name for the Father himself. It is evident, at first sight, that these views of the Divine Nature are not derived from the

threefold Name, which the Saviour applied to God in the great commission to preach the Gospel. There is nothing in these words to sanction the inferiority of the Son; nothing to sustain the notion that the Holy Spirit is an attribute or a mere influence proceeding from God; and nothing to countenance the idea of the Spirit being but another name for the Father himself. The natural and obvious meaning of the passage is decidedly against such notions. In the threefold Name of God we have evidently distinction and co-equality combined; for each one represented in that Name stands in the same relation to us as our God. As, however, the essential points of the Unitarian heresy are involved in the Sabellian creed, the same class of scriptural argumentation which overthrows the one will apply to the subversion of the other; and that evidence will be adduced hereafter.

The Sabellian heresy is somewhat diversified in its minor aspects, but in its substantial principles it maintains that the Deity is an absolute unity; that the distinctions indicated by the terms 'Father, Son, and Holy Ghost' are not real and personal, but nominal or official; that the Father alone is the Deity in his paternal character; that the Son is the same Being or Person incarnate, or 'God manifest in the flesh;' and that the Holy Ghost is also the same Being manifested in his spiritual influences. Now, this doctrine is equally repugnant to the threefold Name ascribed to Jehovah in the great Gospel commission, and in the formula of baptism. It is, indeed, directly contrary to the natural and obvious meaning of language. It is to assert that our Lord has used words without meaning; and not only so, but that he has used them in a sense *contrary* to their usual and proper signification. For in all languages the words Father and Son are *personal* and not nominal designations; and to say that our Lord intended these words to have merely a nominal signification, while in all languages they have a personal signification, is to say that he employed language more likely to deceive than to instruct; and not only so, but that he commanded others to perpetuate the same deception down to the end of time; and this on an occasion when his ostensible purpose was to make God known to mankind! Can we conceive a more revolting impeachment of the wisdom or sincerity of the Teacher and Saviour of mankind?

Moreover, the appellations applied to God in the commission and formula of baptism are expressive of *relations;* and the relations are distinct, and personal as well as distinct; so personal, indeed, that they can be properly applied to none but persons; and so distinct that they are not interchangeable, but fixed and permanent in their personal application. For the relation of a father to his own son involves both a personality that cannot be resolved into a metaphor, and a distinction that cannot be commuted; both relations are grounded in the very nature of things, and are eternally immutable. A father cannot be identical with his own son, and a son cannot be identical with his own father. These terms, therefore, applied to the Deity necessarily involve both distinction and personality; and, consequently, the Sabellian theory is false.

Equally clear is the distinction and personality of the Holy Ghost; for either to resolve him into an attribute of God, or into an influence proceeding from God, or into another name for the Father himself, would involve the grossest absurdities and contradictions. The Holy Ghost is not only here distinguished from the Father by a separate appellation, but he is associated with the Father and the Son in the ordinance of baptism; and hence the Sabellian and Unitarian heresies imply that 'baptism is to be administered in the Name of the Father, and of a creature, and of an attribute;' or 'in the Name of the Father, and of a creature, and of an influence;' or, 'in the Name of the Father, and of a creature, and the Father.' Can we conceive absurdities more glaring? Can we invent a grosser insult against the great Teacher and Redeemer of mankind? Would not the Scriptures, on this principle of interpretation, be the most absurd and deceptive volume ever written? We must either admit such follies and blasphemies, or reject the theories which involve them. Moreover, the fact that baptism is a *religious* ordinance implies the personality of the Holy Spirit, because it is to be performed in his Name, as well as in the Name of the Father and of the Son. Now, the Being in whose name a religious ordinance is performed, must be capable of approving and accepting the ordinance performed in his name: but to approve and accept imply intelligence, and intelligence implies consciousness; and intelligence and consciousness are the properties, not of an attribute, or of an influence,

but of a real, personal existence. Thus, the fact that baptism is commanded to be performed in the Name of the Holy Spirit implies his personality, as much so as it implies the personality of the Father and of the Son. Further evidence of the personality of the Holy Spirit, as displayed in his attributes, will be adduced when we come to discourse on his Godhead.

The sublime facts recorded in connection with the Redeemer's baptism are striking evidences of the distinction and personality of each of the Glorious Three. When our Lord condescended to receive this ordinance at the hands of John, the heavens were opened, and the Holy Spirit descended like a Dove and abode upon him, and a voice proceeded from the parted sky, saying, 'Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.'—Mark i. 10, 11. Here was a visible and oracular demonstration of the distinction and personality of each of the Glorious Three. There was here the presence of the Incarnate Son, submitting to the rite of baptism; the presence of the Holy Spirit, descending in the form of a Dove, and filling his humanity with consecrating power; and the presence of the Father, bearing witness to his incarnation, and proclaiming his own complacency. The Father, therefore, is not the Son, the Son is not the Father, and the Holy Spirit is distinct from both; the distinction, therefore, is real, not nominal; personal, not official. This grand display of the Three Persons in the Saviour's baptism, is a practical illustration of the distinction and personalities intended in the formula of our *own* baptism, and it shivers both the Sabellian and the Unitarian heresy into a thousand fragments.

Another erroneous theory is that of the *Tritheist*, who maintains that there are not simply three personalities, but three separate and independent Beings; or, in other words, three Gods instead of One. It is no small homage to truth when it is assailed by sentiments directly opposite to each other; for in their opposition they mutually destroy each other; and in destroying each other they support the doctrine which is true. The Unitarian and Sabellian maintain the Divine Unity, but deny the Trinity; the Tritheist maintains, on the contrary, the Trinity is so evident, that he denies the Divine Unity, and asserts the existence of three Gods. The whole truth is held by neither party, but a portion of truth is held by both. The

errors of each lie in what each denies, and the truth in what each maintains. The Scriptures maintain as clearly that God is One in one sense, as they do that he is Three in another sense; and as they maintain both, both must be true; and as all truths must harmonize, there is a sense in which a Trinity is compatible with unity. Hence that doctrine alone is orthodox which denies neither the one nor the other, but combines and harmonizes both; which recognizes the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit as really and personally distinct, yet essentially united. This is the Trinitarian doctrine, which maintains a plurality, not of names only, but of persons having distinct consciousness, with mutual participation of the same attributes and essence.

Leaving for a time the name of God, as given in the great commission of our Lord, we proceed to notice that the unity and the trinity of the Divine nature are constantly taught in the sacred volume; and often in the same passages we find *both* are asserted, implied, and intertwined with each other as essentially related truths. Let us, then, advert to a few other passages in which these great truths are set forth. Respecting the Unity of God, it is thus declared: 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me,' Exod. xx. 3. 'Unto thee it was showed, that thou mightest know that Jehovah * he is God; there is none else beside him,' Deut. iv. 35. 'Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that Jehovah he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath: there is none else,' verse 39. 'Hear, O Israel: Jehovah our God is one Jehovah,' Deut. vi. 4. 'Thus saith Jehovah the King of Israel, and his Redeemer Jehovah of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God,' Isa. xliv. 6. These are strong affirmations of the Unity of the Godhead, yet they are uttered, not against the Trinity, but against the false gods of the heathen, and contain a solemn warning against idolatry. The context clearly shows this, for each declaration of the unity of the Godhead is coupled with an admonition against the worship of

* The reader will remember that in every instance where the name LORD is printed in capital letters, it is Jehovah (יהוה) in the original Hebrew. This fact should never be lost sight of in reading the Old Testament; it is a key to the interpretation of many important passages respecting the Divinity of Christ.

heathen deities. Such passages are not only in harmony with the Trinity, but furnish evidence in its support; for, in the first place, it is a *unity* in *trinity* as well as *trinity* in *unity* that is taught; secondly, the names by which God is here set forth are both singular and plural, as will presently be shown, and thus they indicate a *trinity* of persons as well as a *unity* of essence; and, thirdly, just in proportion to the force with which idolatry is denounced in these passages, is the evidence they supply in proof of the Trinity; for if idol worship be denounced, and the worship of Son and Spirit be commanded, then the worship of the latter is not idolatry; and if their worship is not idolatry, they are God as well as the FATHER; for all worship except that of God is idolatry.

A Trinity or plurality of persons, combined with unity of essence, is evident from the names applied to God in the Old Testament. Though this argument is much more obvious to one conversant with the Hebrew language, we shall endeavour to make it plain to the general reader. Every one knows that the Old Testament was written in Hebrew. This language is peculiarly expressive, and its names of objects are not *arbitrary* signs, but significant of their nature and properties, or of some remarkable circumstance designed to be preserved in memory. For example, Adam (אדם) means the *ground*, and was applied to the first man because he was taken from the ground. Abram (אברם) signifies a *high Father*, and was the first name of the Patriarch; but Abraham (אברהם) signifies the *Father of a great multitude*, and was given to the Patriarch when God promised to make him the father of a great nation: 'Neither shall thy name any more be called *Abram*, but *Abraham;* for a father of many nations have I made thee.'—Gen. xvii. 5. Isaac (יצחק) signifies *laughter*, and was given to the son of promise, because of Abraham's joy at the promise of God. Jacob (יעקב) signifies a *supplanter*, and is characteristic of Jacob's conduct towards his brother; but Israel (ישראל) signifies a *prince of God*, and was applied to Jacob when he had wrestled with God in prayer until he prevailed. Jesus, or Joshua (יהושע), means a *Saviour*, and was applied to Christ because he saves his people from their sins. The like examples occur throughout the Old Testament, but these suffice to show the genius of the Hebrew language in perpetuating events and conveying instruction by its

ppropriation of expressive names. In conformity with this eature of the language, the *names* of God are expressive of imself, and were chosen by him for this purpose. Now, the wo principal names which are applied to Deity in the Old Testament are *Jehovah* (יהוה) and *God* (אלהים). The former, *Jehovah*, is God's proper name; it signifies *self-existence* and *ndependence*, and clearly applies to the DIVINE ESSENCE. This ame is always *singular*, and may be rendered HE WHO EXISTS. The other name, Aleim, or Elohim, signifies, according to some exicographers, the supreme majesty and glory of his nature; nd according to others, the relationship of God by covenant o his creatures. This name is *plural*. Now, as it is the genius f the Hebrew language to express the nature of things by the ames affixed to them, and as God designs to impart instruction y the names he has given to himself, the question occurs— Why is the name Jehovah, which refers to his essence, *always* ingular? Plainly to express the *unity* of the Divine essence. Why is the other, Elohim, *plural?* As clearly to denote a *lurality* of persons in the Godhead. In this application of the erms there is nothing strained, fanciful, or far-fetched. It acords with the character of the language, the usages of the Hebrew nation, and, as we shall see, with the nature of the ubject. Every Jew can clearly see this, and candidly acknowedge it, when converted to the Christian faith, and the veil is aken from his heart.

In a multitude of passages these two names of God are *nited together* to express his Divine nature. We take for lustration one of the passages before adduced, when speaking f the *unity* of God: 'Hear, O Israel: Jehovah (יהוה) our -od (אלהים, Elohim, *plural*) is one *Jehovah*.' This associaon of Elohim with Jehovah is the *common* mode in which God peaks of himself to man, almost invariably so when any refernce is made to his nature and his relationship to man. Let e unlettered Christian take up his Bible and mark the freuency with which the name *Jehovah* and *God* are associated, nd he will find that this double name is the one which God has dinarily assumed in addressing mankind. Now, as there must fitness and propriety in the language of God, there must be reason for these names being thus connected. Though the e is singular and the other plural, we are sure that their

connection is proper and even necessary for some important end. But if these terms are appropriate to his nature, and necessary to express it to man, there must be a sense in which he is both *singular* and *plural*—plural in persons, for his name is *Elohim;* singular in essence, for his name is *Jehovah.* If the Trinity were false, the names would be inexplicable, contradictory, and absurd; but if the Trinity be *true*, the genius of the language is consistent, and the names are appropriate, harmonious, and expressive. No name so fitly as the united name *Jehovah Elohim* could express the nature of the Triune God, and his wisdom is our guarantee that he has chosen terms the best adapted to reveal himself to his creatures, and to 'lead us into all truth.'

This argument is strengthened by the ordinary grammatical construction of these names in a sentence, and by some peculiar exceptions in a few remarkable passages. Every one knows that it is a first principle in language that verbs and pronouns should agree in number with the leading noun—the noun to which they are subservient. The observance of this rule of concord is *ordinarily* necessary to render language intelligible. Yet in reference to the name of Elohim, this rule is almost invariably set aside in Scripture. Elohim, though *plural*, is construed with verbs and pronouns in the *singular*—a construction this which could not be admitted without a reason in the nature of the thing itself. But the principle which renders *Jehovah Elohim* harmonious, as the name of God—which renders a singular united with a plural noun the fittest appellation of the Deity—reconciles the anomalous construction of a plural noun with verbs and pronouns in the singular form. There are personalities in the Godhead, and the *plural* Elohim indicates this truth; but in essence he is *one*, and the *singular* form of verbs and pronouns sets it forth.

In a few remarkable instances, where the personalities of the Godhead are designed to be made prominent, the *regular* construction is adopted, and we find Elohim combined with plural verbs and pronouns. For example, the creation of man was an important event, and to man the Godhead was to be revealed. On this occasion, therefore, the personalities of the Deity are expressed in the language employed. 'And God (*the Elohim*) said, Let *us* make man in *our* image, and after *our*

likeness.'—Gen. i. 26. Here we see the pronouns used three times in the passage are all *plural*, conformably with the name employed, and with the doctrine of the Trinity—conformable also with the importance of the occasion—the creation of man, the noblest work of God, and with the fact that to man the Godhead was to be specially revealed. Basil of Seleucia observes on this passage, 'Notice the expression, "*Let* us *make* man."' The plural word hints at the persons of the Godhead, and presents us with the knowledge of the Trinity. The knowledge of it, therefore, is coeval with the creation. Nor should it seem strange that it was afterwards inculcated; since it was one of those things of which mention was made at the very first creation.'

Men have endeavoured to obviate the forcible argument furnished by this text, by maintaining that God uses the plural pronoun because he is speaking to his angels in council; but this flimsy sophism is refuted by four considerations. *First*, the Scriptures never teach that God makes angels his counsellors, but the contrary: 'With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him?'—Isa. xl. 14; *secondly*, angels are never described as the creators of man, or of any other object, even the meanest reptile; *thirdly*, while creation is always declared to be the work of God alone, it is ascribed to Three Persons, to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and, *fourthly*, when we are commanded to remember our *Creator*, the word, like Elohim, is in the plural, 'Remember now thy *Creators* (בוראיך) in the days of thy youth.'* Here, then, we see the reason of the phraseology, 'Let *us* make man in *our* image, and in *our* likeness.'

We have before seen that the name Jehovah, which denotes the essence of the Deity, is always *singular*, and yet, in order to express the true nature of himself to man, is associated with Elohim, a *plural* noun. Now, it is remarkable that on some occasions the name Jehovah is united also with plural verbs and pronouns. Take the following examples. It was a solemn occasion when God interposed to confound the language of

* Though the *yod*, which forms the plural in this word, is wanting in many of the MSS. examined by Dr Kennicott and De Rossi, and is absent also from the ancient versions, yet it is contained in all our common Hebrew Bibles, and in some editions of great value; and as it exactly accords with both doctrine and fact, the probability is that it is genuine.

man, and on this memorable event the personalities of the Godhead are intimated: 'And Jehovah (יהוה) said, Let *us* go down, and there confound (נבלה, let *us* confound) their language.' To weaken this plain indication of plurality, it has been said that Jehovah here adopts the style of earthly monarchs, who, in issuing their decrees and mandates, speak in the plural. But this is an evasion, not an argument, and its absurdity is manifest from three considerations: *First*, there is no evidence that such a style of language was in use amongst monarchs in that early period of the world; *secondly*, even if the usage had existed then, it would be far more probable that earthly potentates would affect the style of God, than that God would borrow his mode of speaking from human affectation and vanity. It is, indeed, altogether inconceivable that God should borrow his mode of speaking of himself from the arrogant assumptions of man; but it is quite natural that men, who assumed the prerogatives and usurped the honours of Deity, should also affect a style which belongs to none but himself. But, *thirdly*, the language employed by God is not a mandate or proclamation; it is not even an address to man at all, but the solemn intercourse of Divine Persons—'Let *us* go down, and let *us* confound their language.' The mode of speaking, therefore, must be regarded as strictly proper, and expressive of mutual intercourse and determination, as to the memorable transaction that was to follow, namely, the confusion of tongues. But, if this language is proper, it implies a plurality in the Godhead; for it can apply to none except those who acted in concert, as united agents in the transaction; and these were not angels, or angels in connection with Deity, but Jehovah himself. To him alone is the event ascribed, 'Because *Jehovah* did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did Jehovah scatter them abroad.'—Gen. xi. 9. Thus the transaction harmonizes with the language, and the language harmonizes with the doctrine. It is only when we distort the language of Scripture to suit a sinister purpose that it speaks discordantly; let it speak freely and naturally, and its voice is consistent both with itself and eternal truth.

We select another example. In Isa. vi. it is recorded that the prophet had a view of the heavenly temple, the holy of holies, and he saw Jehovah high and lifted up. The winged seraphim

stood around and worshipped, and, veiling their faces with their wings before the brightness of his majesty, they uttered a three-fold ascription of praise, crying, 'Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory.' But this exhibition of Jehovah's glory is introductory to a solemn message which he had to send to his people, and the prophet hears the voice of the Lord saying, 'Whom shall I send, and who will go for *us?*'—(ver. 8.) Then follows an awful denunciation against the Jews, giving them up to blindness of mind and hardness of heart—(verses 9, 10)—which has been fulfilled in a remarkable manner. Now let the reader's attention be directed for a moment to the employment of both the singular and plural pronoun, in the 8th verse: 'Whom shall *I* send, and who will go for *us?*' Although one pronoun is singular (*I*) and the other plural (*us*), they both refer to the same Being, namely, 'Jehovah of hosts.' But if this language be proper, there must be a plurality intended. The question then occurs: Is there any collateral evidence that a plurality of persons is in fact here represented? We reply, There is the clearest evidence of this. That the Father is here intended no one will attempt to deny, and there is no need to adduce proof. But inspiration ascribes this prophecy also to the Son and the Holy Ghost. That the presence of the Son is attested we have the testimony of St John, who declares respecting Christ, when quoting this prophecy—'These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him.'—John xii. 41. That the presence of the Holy Ghost is attested is evident from the testimony of St Paul, who, in quoting this very prophecy, declares, 'Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: for the heart of this people is waxed gross,' &c.—Acts xxviii. 25, &c. Now, what are the facts before us? They are these: The Being whose glory the prophet saw, and whose voice the prophet heard, is designated Jehovah of hosts: yet this Being speaks in the plural number —Who will go for *us?* The New Testament gives the solution by ascribing the prophecy to the *Son* and to the *Holy Ghost*, as well as to the Father. Here again the plurality of persons and the unity of the Godhead are clearly recognized. It is in harmony with this distinction and plurality that the

praise of the seraphim is a *threefold* ascription, 'Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts.' We shall have occasion to refer to this passage again. In it the doctrine of the Trinity is evidently taught, and to reject it is to reject the testimony of God.

Numerous other passages in the Old Testament clearly mark a distinction of persons in the Godhead. The place beyond the vail in the sanctuary was called the holy of holies—that is, the holy place of the *Holy Ones*, conformable to the scene in the heavenly temple where Isaiah saw the Jehovah of hosts who said, Who will go for *us?* As the praise of the seraphs was threefold in the temple above, so the benediction of the high priest was specially required and commanded to be *threefold* in the temple made by hands: 'Jehovah bless thee, and keep thee: Jehovah make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: Jehovah lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.'—Numb. vi. 24, &c. Every candid mind will see the correspondence here intended. In Isa. xlviii. 16, there are *three* Divine Persons represented: 'And now the Lord Jehovah, and his Spirit, hath sent me;' or, as Origen renders it, putting Spirit in the objective case, 'And now the Lord Jehovah hath sent me and his Spirit.'* In either case *three* Divine Persons are set forth—the Father, the Spirit, and the Redeemer. This passage shows not only that there is a distinction in the Godhead, but that the distinction is real, and not merely nominal, as the Sabellians maintain.

There is another numerous class of passages which as plainly teach a plurality of persons; such as refer to the persons of the Godhead separately, and speak as distinctly of the Son and Spirit as they do of the Father. 'Thou art my SON; this day have I begotten Thee.'—Ps. ii. 7. The latter clause is predictive of Christ's resurrection, when he was 'begotten from the dead,' and 'declared the Son of God with power.' Again, 'Kiss the

* Τις εστιὺ εν τῳ Ησαιᾳ λεγων, Και νυν Κυριος απεστειλε με και το Πνευμα αυτου; εν ᾧ, αμφιβολου οντος του ῥητου, ποτερον ὁ Πατηρ και το Αγιον Πνευμα απεστειλαν τον Ιησουν, η ὁ Πατηρ απεστειλε τον τε Χριστον και το Αγιον Πνευμα; το δευτερον εστιν αληθες.

'Who is it that saith in Isaiah, And now the Lord hath sent me and His Spirit? As the expression is ambiguous, is it the Father and the Holy Spirit who have sent Jesus; or the Father who have sent both Christ and the Holy Spirit? The latter is the true interpretation.'—ORIGEN *cont. Cels.*, lib. i.

on, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way.'—Ps. ii. 12. Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given.'—Isa. ix. 'Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? who ath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? hat is his name, and what is his Son's name, if thou canst ll?'—Prov. xxx. 4. The glorious person here expressly lled the Son of God is elsewhere called the Messiah, the Reeemer, the Branch, the Lord our Righteousness; and while ese specific appellations clearly indicate his personality, the alted attributes with which he is invested prove, as we shall reafter show, his proper Divinity or Godhead. In the same anner the Old Testament speaks of the Spirit as distinct from oth the Father and Son. 'The Spirit of God moved upon the ce of the waters.'—Gen. i. 2. 'My Spirit shall not always rive with man.'—Gen. vi. 3. 'Thy Spirit is good.'—Ps. cxliii. 0. 'Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the ord.'—Zech. iv. 6. 'The Spirit of God hath made me.'—Job xiii. 4. 'I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.'—Joel ii. 8. 'Take not thy Holy Spirit from me.'—Psa. li. 11. They rebelled, and vexed his Holy Spirit.'—Isa. lxiii. 10. We ed not multiply instances, especially as we shall revert to the bject again. Our object at present is simply to show that the d Testament clearly recognizes a distinction of persons in e Godhead. The passages adduced prove this abundantly, d show that the Divine Persons are set forth under their oper designations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

A few references to the testimony of the New Testament the Trinity may suffice, especially as numerous quotations uld anticipate what has to be adduced hereafter in proof of e Deity of each person.

The New Testament contains the last dispensation of God man, and completes the canon of inspiration. Its teachings designed for all nations, to encounter and destroy all gious delusions, to banish all idolatry from the earth, and give to the whole universe the brightest manifestations of d's nature, character, and will. It gives the light of the wledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ; yet everywhere it beams with the doctrine of the Trinity. New Testament is full of this truth, as the hypercriticism,

evasions, and distorted interpretations of the Unitarian and the Sabellian confess. If the doctrine of the Trinity be an error, the New Testament is of all books the most adapted to foster that delusion where it previously existed, and to diffuse it where it was not already known. But the doctrine is true, and the New Testament confirms and establishes it by the clearest evidence, as a doctrine taught by the authority of God.

At our Saviour's baptism, as we have already seen, the doctrine of the Divine THREE presents itself, and thus the doctrine stands before us at the very threshold of the Christian system. So in our own baptism the doctrine is proclaimed. Thus, the very first truth a disciple had to hear and to learn on being admitted to the Church, was the distinction of the Godhead into Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. No one could enter the portals of the Christian edifice without being acquainted with the Glorious Trinity. The knowledge of many other truths might be reserved to a future period, but the *babe* in Christ must be taught to lisp the name of the *Triune God.* In the Apostolic benediction the personalities of the Godhead are made prominent: 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.'—2 Cor. xiii. 14. Here the Glorious Three are addressed in prayer, as the united fountain of grace and love. But we need not multiply passages, as the very phraseology of the New Testament is constructed upon the distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and every page attests it. Thus, the representations given of the Deity in the New Testament harmonize with the teachings of the Old. As might be expected, in the latter dispensation the truths of the former are expanded, and set forth with clearer lustre. The plurality of the name *Elohim*, so constantly used in the venerable records of Moses and the prophets, becomes merged into the clearer manifestation and emphatic declaration of Father, Son, and Spirit, in the teachings of Christ and his Apostles. It is to be observed, too, that the distinction of persons in the Godhead never exceeds a Trinity. In some passages *one* Divine Person only is named; in others, *two;* and in others, *three;* but neither by direct statement nor implication is this number ever exceeded; and this is another evidence that the distinction is real, and not merely nominal or apparent.

Trinal are the names assigned to them, and trinal the relations they sustain to each other, and to man, in the economy of redemption; trinal the doxologies ascribed to them in heaven, and trinal the benedictions implored from them by the Church on earth. Yet these three are ONE JEHOVAH—one in essence, and co-equal in glory, as their name יהוה אלהים Jehovah Elohim imports, and their union in our worship and our baptism proclaims.

If, then, the Scriptures be our guide, our first proposition is established by their authority, '*that while God is truly One in essence, he is truly and really distinguished by a threefold personality.*' To render our argument complete, we have yet to demonstrate, from the Holy Scriptures, that each personal distinction in the Godhead is described as possessing true and proper Divinity; but this belongs to our second proposition and must form the subject of our next chapter.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DEITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

THAT there is a distinction of persons in the Godhead we have already proved from the Holy Scriptures; and we now proceed to establish our second proposition, which is, that each personal distinction in the Godhead is described as possessing true and proper DIVINITY. The Deity of the Father is unanimously admitted, and therefore presents no material for controversy. The Deity of the Son and Holy Spirit is also explicitly revealed, and this we shall demonstrate from the pages of inspiration. That our Lord had the nature of man the Scriptures clearly maintain, for to fulfil the purposes of redemption it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren; he was therefore born of a woman, and made under the law; was made flesh, and dwelt amongst mankind. But, at the same time, they as clearly teach that he is truly God. We do not hesitate to affirm that the Holy Scriptures are as express in asserting the Deity of our Lord as they are in teaching his humanity. In what way do they make

known the humanity of the Lord Jesus, but by applying to him the name of man; ascribing to him the ordinary attributes of man; and by giving us the history of his birth, his life, and death? And in what way do the Holy Scriptures teach us the proper Deity of Jesus Christ? Just in such a way as the subject required. By giving him the names of God; by investing him with the attributes of God; by ascribing to him the works and the prerogatives of God. The mode of proceeding, and the language adopted by the inspired writers in the description of our Lord's Divine nature, are just as natural and appropriate as in the description of his human nature, and as much calculated to carry conviction to a prayerful and humble mind. Let us, then, attend to their instruction.

In the first place, we observe, the Scriptures apply to our Lord the names of God.

1. They emphatically call him *God*, using the term as expressing proper Divinity. St John begins his Gospel by applying this appellation to Christ: 'In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God.' We grant that the term 'God' is used sometimes in an inferior sense, and is thus applied to created beings; but then in such cases it is always connected with some qualifying clause or expression which marks that inferiority, and precludes the possibility of mistaking the object intended. For example, in Ps. lxxxii., the word 'God' is applied to magistrates and rulers: 'I have said, Ye are gods;' but it is immediately added, 'Ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes.' Now, when this term is applied to our Lord, there is no clause introduced to sink its meaning, and detract from the dignity it expresses. On the contrary, its connection shows it to be employed in its proper sense, in its highest import. In the passage just quoted from St John the Saviour is called God, and a clause immediately follows, ascribing to him the creation of the universe—'All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made.' Thus, the same passage ascribes to him not only the *name*, but the *works* of God, and this irresistibly fixes its meaning in the highest sense. This passage, too, involves a principle of interpretation which applies to every other text where the Saviour is called God. For, as the word here expresses the Being who made

he universe, it necessarily carries the same meaning wherever t is applied to Christ, and thus shows that it invariably de-ignates his proper Deity. In Heb. i. 8, the name of God is pplied to our Lord: 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ver: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy king-lom.' This is a quotation from Ps. xlv., and the Chaldee araphrase applies this Psalm to the Messiah. Though this act cannot add to the authority of an inspired Apostle, yet it s interesting to observe how the ancient Jewish writings armonize with the New Testament in applying Old Testament Scriptures to Christ. Thus, both by the inspired Psalmist, nd the Apostle in his quotation, the Saviour is called God; nd for the reasons before stated the word is used as expressive f his proper Deity. If additional proof were necessary, we ave it in the 11th verse of the same chapter, where St Paul, ke John, attributes the creation of the world to Christ, and lso asserts his Divine nature to be eternal and unchangeable verses 10—12).

Thomas, the disciple who had evinced so much incredulity, pplies to the Saviour the two Divine titles of *Lord* and *God*. And Thomas said unto him, My Lord and my God.'—John x. 28. To evade the force of this passage, it has been argued hat the language of Thomas is that of exclamation, and must ot be understood as applicable to Christ, but to the Father; ut this is totally inadmissible, for it is contradicted by the hole strain of the passage and context. The entire transac-on shows that the language employed was the language of *irect recognition*. Thomas had avowed his unbelief in the aviour's resurrection, and declared that he would not believe nless he put his finger in the print of the nails, and thrust his nd into his side. The Saviour appears, and challenges Thomas use his own test of the fact. 'Reach hither thy finger, and ehold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into y side: and be not faithless, but believing.' The incredulous sciple is now satisfied that it is indeed the Saviour who stands fore him, and expresses his recognition by saying unto him, Ay Lord and my God.' The address was direct to Christ; e language, therefore, was a recognition of his person, and e titles applied are those which belong to Deity alone. The rms 'Lord' and 'God,' thus connected, are equivalent to

Jehovah Elohim of the Old Testament, the highest titles which Deity has assumed.

We are aware it may be replied, 'Admitting your reasoning to be correct, yet are we authorized to believe that Thomas was right in applying such Divine titles to Christ?' Undoubtedly we are, because our Lord tacitly admits their application to himself. If the titles 'Lord' and 'God' had been improper, they involved the greatest ignorance and delusion on the part of Thomas, such as our Lord would undoubtedly have corrected, especially in one who was chosen to be a teacher of religion. Moreover, if the titles had been improper, it was an act of gross idolatry on the part of Thomas to apply them to Christ; and for Christ to receive them was both to connive at the idolatry of the disciple, and himself to usurp the prerogatives of God. But as such an idea is monstrous, and cannot for a moment be entertained, we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that the titles ascribed were proper in themselves, and were, on this account, approved by our Lord. This view derives further confirmation from the fact, that the design of our Lord, in appearing to his disciples, was not only to give them infallible proof of his resurrection, but to afford them further instruction, to remove their remaining prejudices and errors, to give them clear views of his own nature and the important purposes of his mission, and thus to qualify them for the great work of teaching the truths of the Gospel to mankind; therefore, had the titles of 'Lord' and 'God' been inapplicable to Christ, the design of his appearing specially required that the delusion should be dispelled. We often find our Lord, after his resurrection, reproving the errors of the disciples, but no reproof is given for the ascriptions of these august titles. In the passage before us, he reproves the unbelief of Thomas, and yet admits the honours ascribed to himself. Now, idolatry is a greater sin than unbelief in this instance, and would, if practised, have required stronger marks of disapproval and condemnation. The fact, then, that our Lord admitted these Divine titles to be ascribed to him in the presence of his disciples, is conclusive evidence that he approved of them; and if he approved of them, they were, in the strictest sense, proper.

In Acts xx. 28, Christ is called God—'Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.' True, there

s a variety in the reading of this passage: some manuscripts ave it 'church of the Lord;' others, the 'church of the Lord God;' and others, the 'church of God,' as in the received text. But Dr Scholz, who has examined nearly three hundred manuscripts beyond what his predecessors had done, retains the received reading. The Vulgate has it, 'the church of God;' the Arabic, 'the church of the Lord God.' The authority of the eceived text is further supported by the *usus loquendi* of Scripture, for while the phrase 'the church of God' occurs *leven* times in Scripture, the phrase 'the church of the Lord' s not found in any part of Scripture. We therefore hold the eceived text as genuine, and as he who shed his blood for the hurch was the Saviour, and as that Being is here designated God,' it follows that Christ is 'God.'

2. In Matt. i. 22, 23, the blessed Saviour is called '*Emanuel*,' or '*God with us*.' Speaking of the miraculous conception and incarnation of our Lord, the evangelist says, 'Now ll this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of he Lord by the prophet (Isaiah vii. 14), saying, Behold, a irgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they hall call his name EMMANUEL, which being interpreted is, God ith us.' This name clearly affirms his two-fold nature. In his Divine nature he was God, but, by becoming incarnate, he was God with us; God united to human nature, and dwelling with an. This accords both with the doctrine and the phraseology f St John, who, after declaring Christ to be God, the Maker f all things, asserts, 'And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt mong us.' In like manner St Paul declares this to be the reat mystery of the Christian system. 'And without controersy, great is the mystery of godliness: God * was manifest

* The authorities decidedly preponderate in favour of the word *God*, as it nds in the received text; and it was adopted by Griesbach, in his first edition the Greek Testament, and is retained by that industrious and candid collator, holz. But whether we take the word (Θεος) *God*, or the word, (ὃς) *who*, as in e reading of the second edition of Griesbach, the sense is precisely the same; the masculine relative (ὃς) can refer to no antecedent noun but the word *God*, the preceding clause. It cannot refer to the word (εὐσέβεια) *godliness*, for it is feminine; it cannot refer to the word (μυστήριον) *mystery*, for that is euter; it cannot refer to the word (ἀληθεια) *truth*, for that is feminine; it not refer to the word (ἑδραίωμα) *ground* or *foundation*, for that is neuter, d, besides, it would make no sense of the passage; it cannot refer to the word στύλος) *pillar*, for the same reason; and it cannot refer to the word (ἐκκλησια)

in the flesh.' There were other mysteries in the Christian system, but that Jehovah should condescend to veil his glory in human flesh was emphatically the 'great mystery,' and might well present wonders which angels desire to look into. Indeed, if Christ were a mere man, what mystery could there be in his being made manifest in the flesh? Are not all men manifest by the flesh? and in what other way could Christ, if a mere man, become manifest? Here would be no mystery at all, but a common, every-day occurrence. But as God, his becoming manifest in human nature is an astounding mystery of condescension and love.

3. The prophet Isaiah, in predicting the coming of the Messiah and its blessed results, designates him 'OUR GOD.' 'The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.'—Isaiah xl. 3. That this prophecy applies to Christ, whose way was prepared by John the Baptist, we know, not only from the general facts recorded in the Gospel, but from inspired authority; for St Luke expressly applies it to our Lord —'As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.'—Luke iii. 4. The term, 'Our God,' being applied to Christ, irresistibly establishes his Godhead; for though the term 'God,' used simply, has sometimes an inferior signification, and is applied to created beings, yet the term 'Our God' is never thus applied, and never can be thus applied. For who are they who are represented by the pronoun '*Our*'? Undoubtedly the whole Church of God in all ages. Is it then possible for the whole Church of God to unite in saying respecting a mere creature—This is 'Our God'? Our nature, our reason, feels that it is impossible. No mere creature is 'Our God;' therefore no mere creature can be acknowledged as 'Our God.' For he who is 'Our God' must be our Creator, our Benefactor, our Judge, and the object of our supreme adoration. But Christ is called

church, for this is feminine, and the sense also forbids it. It can therefore refer to no antecedent but the word Θεος, and with this it has a perfect concord, both in gender and sense. The philology and divinity here completely harmonize, and give propriety, spirit, and vigour to the Apostle's statement, that '*great* is the mystery of godliness;' for what is so great a mystery as the incarnation of God?

'Our God' by the highest authority, and therefore the application of the term to him proves beyond dispute his proper Godhead. 'This God is our God for ever and ever: and he will be our guide even unto death.'

4. Christ is also designated 'The Lord God.' The Angel Gabriel, delivering a solemn message to Zacharias in reference to the office of John the Baptist as the forerunner of Christ, designates the latter The Lord God. 'And many of the children of Israel shall he (John) turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias,' &c.—Luke i. 16, 17. It would be superfluous to employ argumentation to show that the double name 'Lord God' can apply to no created being, whether man or angel, since we have already proved that it is the peculiar name by which Jehovah specially revealed himself to his Church; but this name is applied to Christ, and therefore proves his proper Deity. There are many other passages in which the name God is applied to the Saviour; but to examine the whole would protract this treatise to an undue length. The reader, at his leisure, may consult the following portions of the inspired Word: 1 John iii. 2—5; Eph. v. 5. Compare 2 Cor. v. 10 with Rev. i. 7, and xx. 12.

Before we dismiss the consideration of this part of our subject, it may be proper to notice one passage which has frequently been adduced by mistaken men to prove that our Saviour disowns the name of God. When the rich young nobleman came to him, saying, 'Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?' our Lord inquired, 'Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God.'—Matt. xix. 16. It is most unfortunate for the Unitarian theory to press this passage into its service; for if it disproves the Saviour's *Deity*, it also disproves his *goodness*. Pitiful must be the system which cannot establish itself without impeaching the character of our Lord; which cannot strip the Saviour of Divinity without divesting him of goodness too; which, in making him a mere man, is reduced to the necessity of making him also a sinner. It is kindred dilemma to that of the Jews, when, in the perplexity of unbelief, they said with one breath—'As for this fellow, we know not whence he is;' and again, 'Give God the praise: we know that this man is a sinner.' But let us analyze the words of our Lord, and we shall soon find that they neither express

nor imply a disavowal of his Deity. His words consist of two parts—an inquiry and an assertion. The inquiry has reference, not to his *Deity*, but to his *goodness*. 'Why callest thou me good?' But does this inquiry imply that he was not good? Not good? and yet the great Teacher of men, and the example of the most perfect holiness, obedience, and benevolence! Not good? and yet the whole testimony of Scripture asserts his immaculate innocence and disinterested love! Not good? and yet the Father, once and again, proclaims from heaven that he was his beloved Son, in whom he was well pleased; and inspired apostles declare that he was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners—that he knew no sin, that in him was no sin! He was not only good, but perfectly and absolutely good. The question expresses no doubt of his goodness, but requires from the young man who uses it the reason for his using it; and the stress of the question rests upon the first word in the inquiry, '*Why?*' It was customary for our Lord to test the sincerity of men's professions both of knowledge and of faith by proposing some searching question. Hence on another occasion, when men acknowledged the Messiah to be the Son of David, he demands from them how it was that David, in the Spirit, called him Lord? and how it was he could at once be David's Lord and David's Son? The question was not proposed to imply a doubt respecting his being David's Son, but to test the judgment and sincerity of those so forward in their professions and vain in their confidence. So in the present instance his inquiry, '*Why* callest thou me good?' implied no doubt or denial of his own goodness, but was designed to test the young man's sincerity in applying that word; so that instead of using it as a compliment, he might be led to ascertain the true grounds on which alone the term was applicable to him. There is also an '*assertion*' contained in our Lord's reply, and it supports our argument for his proper Deity. He asserts, 'There is none good but one, that is, God.' As the *inquiry* involves no doubt respecting Christ's goodness, so this *assertion* involves no doubt respecting his Deity. On the contrary, it maintains it; for as it is beyond contradiction that Christ is good, so it follows that, if there be none good but God, then Christ himself must be God. This was doubtless the conclusion to which Christ was desirous to lead the young man,

and his language was admirably adapted to establish this conviction in his mind. The young man approached him merely as a good *Master* or *Teacher*, but the reply of the Saviour was designed to convince him that he was not only his instructor, but his God.

5. Our Lord is also designated 'THE MIGHTY GOD,' 'For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, THE MIGHTY GOD, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.'—Isa. ix. 6. No perverted ingenuity can succeed in distorting this passage from its plain and obvious meaning, and no additional observations can increase its force. It asserts, as plainly as language can speak, the twofold nature of Christ, and places them before us in sublime contrast. In his human nature he is the 'child born,' but in his Divine nature he is emphatically 'THE MIGHTY GOD.' In harmony with this striking language of Isaiah, the Apostle Paul designates our Lord, *The Great God:* 'Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the Great GOD AND OUR SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.'—Titus ii. 13. The two appellations, *Great God* and our Saviour Jesus Christ, according to the construction of the Greek language, both refer to our Lord. We take a parallel case in reference to the Father, which will render the nature of the construction obvious to the eye of the general reader; 'Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto *God and his Father*,' &c.—Rev. i. 5, 6. Now, every one will perceive that the words '*God and his Father*' refer to the same Divine Person, and that its meaning is—God, even his Father; so in the other passage, the words 'the Great God and our Saviour,' apply to the same person, and clearly signify—*the Great God, who is our Saviour Jesus Christ.* This meaning is sustained, too, not only by the natural and regular construction of the Greek language,* but by the context, for

* The Greek construction we refer to is this—that when the first noun in a sentence takes the article, the second and third nouns, &c., being attributes of the first, do not take the article, and the omission of the article is an indication that the nouns thus circumstanced refer to the same subject or person implied in the first noun. The passage adduced above is of this construction, '*του μεγαλου Θεου και Σωτηρος ημων Ιησου Χριστου.*' Now, in conformity with this law of construction, the words 'Great God and Saviour Jesus Christ'

in the preceding passage the Saviour is called God: 'That they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things,' ver. 10. Moreover, the fact that Christ is to be our judge at the last day confirms the application of the passage before us to Christ alone. The Scriptures nowhere speak of the visible appearing of the *Father* in the great day of judgment. Hence, it is said, 'We must all appear before the judgment-seat of *Christ*,' 'for the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.' It is not, therefore, for the appearing of the Father that believers look, but for the appearing of the Son, who has appeared once already, and is to come a second time, for 'unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.' Since, then, it is the glorious appearing of our Judge, whom believers are taught to expect in this passage, and whom he designates 'the great God and our Saviour,' the evidence is decisive that Christ is intended; and the testimony of the Old Testament, which calls him The *Mighty God*, harmonizes with the New Testament, which calls him *The Great God*.

6. Our Lord is also designated 'THE TRUE GOD,' as is evident from the following passage:—'And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true,

must relate to one person, as much so as the following words, 'Βασιλεις και ιερεις τῳ Θεῳ και πατρὶ αυτου.' No one can doubt but that 'God and Father' here relate to one and the same person; but the evidence is precisely the same for the preceding passage, and for a number of others where the name of the Saviour has the same association with Θεος. Compare Rom. xv. 6, Eph. v. 20, James i. 27, with the above; and Eph. v. 5, Titus ii. 13, 2 Peter i. 1. In reference to this subject, Mr Wordsworth, some years ago, devoted great labour in searching the Greek Fathers, to see whether this idiom prevailed in their writings, and whether they ever understood more than one person to be intended by such expressions, and he gives the result of his labour in the following words: 'I have observed more, I am persuaded, than a *thousand instances* of the form ὁ Χριστος και Θεος (*Christ and God*), Eph. v. 5; *some hundreds* of instances of ὁ μεγας Θεος και Σωτηρ (*the Great God and Saviour*), Titus ii. 13; and not fewer than *several thousands* of the words ὁ Θεος και Σωτηρ (*God and Saviour*), 2 Peter i. 1; while in no single case have I seen (where the sense could be determined) any one of them used but only of one person' Mr Hugh Stuart Boyd has investigated the subject with reference to the writings of the classics as well as the Fathers, and his testimony is to the same effect. Indeed, he gives numerous quotations from both, and challenges a single instance to be adduced from any Greek writer of authority in contradiction to the principle of construction laid down. This important principle, therefore, may be regarded as decided, and it brings a large accession of evidence in support of the Deity of Christ.

even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is The True God, and eternal life.' And the apostle immediately adds, 'Little children, keep yourselves from idols.'—1 John v. 20, 21. Here Jesus Christ is distinguished by two titles—one is *The True God*, the other is *Eternal Life*. That the pronoun '*This*' refers to the antecedent '*Jesus Christ*,' is clearly established both by the laws of grammar and the sense; for Jesus Christ is the conspicuous object of the whole passage. The title of '*Eternal Life*' confirms this decision, for this same title is given to Christ by St John in a preceding passage:—'That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the WORD OF LIFE; for the LIFE was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you That ETERNAL LIFE, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us,'—i. 1, 2. Can anything be more clear than the application of the name '*Eternal Life*' to Christ in this passage? It is he who was with the Father, but who was 'manifested' unto men, whom the apostles '*had seen*,' and whom they had '*handled*,' who is here styled '*Eternal Life*.' And who was this but Christ?—Him they had heard, Him they had seen with their eyes. Him their hands had handled, and Him the apostle calls That Eternal Life. Thus previously identified, there is no question as to whom the apostle refers in the subsequent passage, when he employs the same designation. The conclusion, therefore, is inevitable—Jesus Christ is called THE TRUE GOD, and ETERNAL LIFE. This appellation, however, is only a repetition in words of what St John had previously asserted in sense in the first chapter of his Gospel. For as he there declares him to be God, by whom the world and all things were made, he necessarily shows him to be 'The True God,' the eternal self-existing Being of whom Moses wrote when he recorded, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.'

7. The Saviour is also denominated 'THE BLESSED GOD,' and 'GOD OVER ALL,' for thus the Apostle speaks of him in Rom. ix. 5—'Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.' In this passage a distinction is made between the two natures of Christ. His human nature is distinguished by the

words (*κατὰ σάρκα*) 'according to the flesh.' This nature, it is said, descended from the Jews, and this fact is justly taken into the catalogue of privileges conferred upon the Jewish nation. His Divine nature is distinguished by three Divine titles—one expresses his *proper Deity*—he is God; another, his *Supremacy*—he is 'OVER ALL;' and the third declares him 'THE BLESSED ONE'—He is 'BLESSED FOR EVER.' By no license of language can these titles be applied to any but the Supreme God; and it is necessary to add that, as Hugh Stuart Boyd observes, the early Christian writers apply this passage to Christ in every instance wherein they quote it. Of the same meaning with 'GOD OF ALL' is the Divine title 'LORD OF ALL,' which the Apostle Peter applies to the Saviour. 'The word which (*was*) sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: HE IS LORD OF ALL.'—Acts x. 36. St Paul, speaking of Christ, gives him the same august title: 'For the same LORD OVER ALL is rich unto all that call upon him.'—Rom. x. 12. And again he calls him 'THE LORD OF GLORY'—'Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known, they would not have crucified THE LORD OF GLORY.'—1 Cor. ii. 8. In the same exalted sense he is called KING *of kings, and* LORD *of lords*—'The Lamb shall overcome them: for he is LORD of lords, and KING of kings.' And again, he whose name is THE WORD OF GOD (*ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*) 'hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.'—Rev. xvii. 14; xix. 13, 16. All these Divine titles proclaim the Deity of the Saviour.

8. The Lord Jesus is denominated 'JEHOVAH.' We have already remarked that this name is expressive of eternal and unchangeable existence, and, both in its import and as a title, can be applicable to none but God. Isa. xlii. 8, God declares, 'I am Jehovah: that is my name: and My glory will I not give to another.' Kimchi, an eminent Jewish commentator, says, on this passage, 'Jehovah, that is my name,' &c.—'*that name is proper to him.*' In another place, speaking of God, he observes, 'in the name EL and Elohim, he communicates with others; but in this name Jehovah he communicates with none.' This is strictly true, and the learning of Kimchi stamps it with high authority, but it is authenticated by authority infinitely higher—by the authority of God; for it is plainly

asserted in Psalm lxxxiii. 18, 'That men may know that thou, whose name alone is JEHOVAH, art the Most High over all the earth.' Thus the Scriptures affirm that the name Jehovah belongs to none but God the Most High over all the earth; yet in numerous passages this sacred name is applied to Christ. Thus Jehovah speaks: 'And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon ME whom they have pierced.'—Zech. xii. 10. St John seems to have had this prophecy presented before him, when he says respecting our Lord, 'Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him.'—Rev. i. 7. Christ is also called JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. 'Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a righteous BRANCH, and a KING shall reign and prosper . . . . and this is his name whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.'—Jer. xxiii. 5, 6. To invalidate this important passage, it has been alleged that the Church is called 'Jehovah our righteousness.' The reference is to Jeremiah xxxiii. 15, 16—'In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our righteousness.' There is something singular in our translation having the phrase, 'this is the name wherewith *she* shall be called;' but the seeming difficulty vanishes before an enlightened criticism; for the reference is *not* to the Church, but to the '*righteous branch*' proceeding from *David*. This must be Christ, for this is one of his titles. He is called the Son or '*Branch*' of David according to the flesh; and he is 'Jehovah our righteousness' according to his Divine nature. But these titles cannot belong to the Church; for she is neither the 'Branch of righteousness,' nor the 'Son of David,' nor 'Jehovah our righteousness.' But it is asked, How comes it to pass that we read in our version or translation, '*she* shall be called the Lord our righteousness?' The difficulty is easily explained. The Hebrew pronoun rendered *she* differs very little in its form from the pronoun rendered *he*. The only difference is a small

stroke; and this must have been omitted by a transcriber of some ancient copy. Of this there is satisfactory evidence; for it is HE, and not *she*, in the Chaldee paraphrase, in the Syriac and Vulgate versions; and Dr Kennicott, in searching ancient manuscripts, found a various reading in the Hebrew which conforms to all the versions I have named, and makes it HE and not *she;* and thus conforms to the sense of the passage. Here, then, the passage, we see, ought to read that HE—the righteous Branch—that HE—who proceeds from David, HE shall be called the *Lord our righteousness.* So that the objection about the Church being called the Lord our righteousness falls to the ground. The passage is obviously parallel to the one quoted above, predicting the same event, speaking of the same Glorious Being, investing him with the same Divine title, and furnishing the same evidence of his Godhead, for he who is 'Jehovah our righteousness' is truly our Saviour and our God.

This title is recognized in the New Testament, where Christ is said to be made unto us wisdom, RIGHTEOUSNESS, sanctification, and redemption. Numerous passages in the Old Testament, where Jehovah is spoken of, are quoted in the New Testament, and expressly applied to our Saviour: 'Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that *Jehovah God* (יה אלהים) might dwell among them.'—Psalm lxviii. 18. This was a prophecy of the ascension of Christ, as St Paul asserts, quoting this very passage, 'Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now that he ascended, what it is but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.'—Eph. iv. 8—10. This so clearly speaks of the burial and resurrection of Christ, as to defy all perverted ingenuity to give it another meaning; yet he who is thus described is called 'JEHOVAH GOD!' In the first chapter of Hebrews, verse 10, the same apostle quotes a passage from the 102nd Psalm, and applies it to Christ, saying, 'Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:' but in the Psalm from which this is quoted, this Glorious Being is denominated Jehovah not less than eight times.

9. We further remark, Christ is called 'JEHOVAH of HOSTS.' The Apostle Peter, in his first Epistle, ii. 8, speaks of Christ as 'a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence;' but this is a quotation from Isa. viii. 14, where this stone of stumbling is said to be Jehovah of hosts. 'Sanctify JEHOVAH OF HOSTS himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence.' Seven times is the sacred name of Jehovah used in this chapter; and the melancholy history of the Jewish nation shows us in what respect Jehovah (Christ) was a stumbling-block to them, and presents a fulfilment of this prophecy awfully true to the very letter. In John xii. 41, the evangelist, speaking of Christ, says, 'These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him.' The things which Esaias spake are stated in the preceding verse, and we find this prophecy revealed in Isaiah vi. The evangelist states that the prophet saw Christ's glory at the time of the revelation; and there we find the sublime manifestation referred to, and the seraphs veiling their faces before his awful majesty. But he whom the evangelist speaks of as CHRIST, in his humbled and incarnate state, the prophet identifies in his pre-existent glory as 'JEHOVAH,' and the seraphs adore him as *Jehovah of hosts*.' The passage is too important and sublime to be omitted. 'In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also *the Lord* sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphs: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another and said, Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory.' The evidence that Christ here called Jehovah of hosts is too bright to be resisted, and the authority too sacred to be impugned. Now, let the reader remember the declaration we previously adduced from the word of God, which proclaims that 'He whose name *alone* is Jehovah the Most High over all the earth,' and then compare this assertion with the fact before us, that the name 'Jehovah,' and various combinations, 'as Jehovah God,' 'Jehovah our righteousness,' and 'Jehovah of hosts,' are applied to Christ, and he will have before him a complete demonstration of the proper Deity of Christ.

The New Testament being written in Greek, the name Jehovah, which is Hebrew, does not occur in it; the word is not used by evangelists or apostles in reference to either Father, Son, or Spirit. Indeed, that name had ceased to be pronounced, except by the high priest in the temple. In the Septuagint version the word Κυρίος, LORD, is used instead of Jehovah, and so it is by the New Testament writers. When they quote from the Old Testament such passages as contain the name Jehovah, they use the word Κυρίος, LORD, in its stead, whether that name be applied to the Father, Son, or Spirit; and, indeed, in their own compositions this word is constantly applied to the Deity, whichever person may be intended. This word, in its radical meaning, signifies existence,* like the word Jehovah; and though custom has not restricted it to God alone, yet when applied to him it must be understood to represent the meaning intended by the name Jehovah. This will not be disputed in reference to the Father; but as we have abundantly shown that the word Jehovah, with all its sacred combinations, is applied to Christ, it will necessarily follow that the word Κυρίος, LORD, is also applicable to him in its highest sense—as the substitute for Jehovah, in the same sense in which it is applied to the Father, and is thus applied to him in a multitude of instances. The numerous passages quoted from the Old Testament, and applied by the apostles to Christ, so fully establish this, as to show that the names 'Jehovah' and 'Lord' are convertible terms as applied to Christ, and the word 'Lord' is applied to the Redeemer about a thousand times in the New Testament.

Sometimes, both in the Old and New Testament, a *periphrasis* is used to express the same idea as Jehovah—that is, several words are employed as explanatory of its meaning. A few examples will make this quite clear. 'Hearken unto me, O Jacob and Israel, my called; I am he; I am the first, I also am the last.' Again, 'I Jehovah, the first, and with the last; I am he.' Once more, 'Thus saith Jehovah the King of Israel, and his Redeemer Jehovah of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God.'—Isa. xlviii. 12; xli. 4;

* Κυρίος, *a* κυρειν, quod notat *esse*, *existere*, ὑπάρχειν. That is, it is derived from the verb κυρειν, which signifies *to be, to exist, to cause*.—SCHLEUSNER.

liv. 6. From these passages it is clear that the terms 'THE IRST AND THE LAST' are not only titles of Deity, but are ex-lanatory of the name Jehovah—are expressive of Him who is ternal in his existence and unchangeable in his nature. Now, hese Divine titles are ascribed to our Lord and Saviour: 'I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the First and he Last. I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you hese things in the churches.' 'And when I saw him, I fell t his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, say-ng unto me, Fear not; I am the FIRST and the LAST: I am e that liveth, and was dead.' 'I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, saith the Lord, which is, and which ras, and which is to come, the Almighty.'—Rev. xxii. 13, 16; 17, 18; i. 8. The two former passages most clearly refer to esus; and that the third does, is highly probable, both from the ontext and the identity of the phraseology. Since, then, the tle, 'The First and the Last,' is the periphrasis for Jehovah in ie Old Testament, and this is applied to Jesus in the New, it rnishes an additional declaration of his proper Deity. In the exts we have just adduced, several other terms are introduced xpressive of the same meaning. He is called the Alpha and mega. Alpha is the first and Omega the last letter in the reek alphabet, and the import is, that he is the origin and ject of all things. He is called the 'One WHO IS, WHO WAS, d WHO IS TO COME;' and this is but another periphrasis for hovah—another mode of expressing his eternal and unchange-le nature. It appears that he is also here called the ALMIGHTY, nich word explains itself as an appellative suited to him alone o in the highest sense is God. The word (*παντοκράτωρ*) mighty is frequently used, and it always means, as Schleus-r says, 'The Omnipotent Being, who has all things in his own wer, and on whose will and pleasure all created beings are pendent;' and (*est nomen soli Deo proprium*) 'is a name per only unto God.' The following passage illustrates and firms this view: 'Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord d Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of nts. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? thou only art holy.'—Rev. xv. 3, 4.

We may now close our first argument for the Deity of our iour, and the sum of the evidence adduced is this: all the

august and sacred titles of the Father are ascribed to the Son; if, then, those titles declare the proper Deity of the Father, they as plainly declare the proper Deity of the Son.

In the next place, we proceed to show that the attributes of Deity are ascribed to the Lord Jesus.

1. *Eternity* is ascribed to the Saviour of men. This attribute can be affirmed of no being but God; for every creature, however exalted, must have had a beginning. Millions of ages may have elapsed, and material systems of the universe may have run through a myriad cycles of alternate renovation and decay since the first intelligent being commenced his history; yet as no multiplication of ages can make eternity, there must have been a period when that being had no existence, and a period when his existence began: but of Jehovah it is affirmed, 'From everlasting to everlasting thou art God.' This essential attribute of Deity is applied to Christ. His eternity is both expressed and implied in a variety of ways. The name Jehovah, we have seen, is ascribed to him in all its sacred combinations, and this implies his eternity; for were he not eternal, this name would not only be irrelevant, but totally incompatible and deceptive; and just in proportion as we are compelled to believe that God could not deceive his creatures—just in proportion as we are compelled to believe that God has employed terms adapted, yea, the best adapted, to convey suitable ideas of himself, are we compelled to believe in the eternal existence of Jehovah Jesus. This attribute is maintained by our Lord in that remarkable expression, 'Before Abraham was, I AM.'—John viii. 58. For this is not only an assertion of existence prior to that patriarch, but of his eternity. The phrase 'I am,' like others we have previously noticed, is expressive of *Jehovah*, '*I who am*,' or '*I who exist*,' and corresponds with the name which God applied to himself when he appeared to Moses in the burning bush; and, indeed, it seems to have been assumed by Christ in allusion to that memorable occasion. Moses asked under what name he should speak of God unto the people of Israel, and 'God said unto him, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say, I AM hath sent me unto you.' Then in the next verse, God declares himself the Jehovah God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.—Exod. iii. 14, 15.*

* The author is aware the future tense is used in the original (אהיה), but this

Now, looking at the allusion to Abraham in both passages, and the fact that Christ asserts his pre-existence in such peculiar language—in language which expresses in Greek substantially the same which was expressed to Moses in Hebrew—we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that Christ here intended to assert his eternity, just in the same manner as the name I AM asserted to Moses the eternity of the glorious Being who appeared to him. 'Before Abraham was, I AM;' that is, as Calmet says, 'I am from all eternity, I have existed before all ages.' The same truth is implied when our Lord, in his solemn prayer, refers to his pre-existent glory with the Father. 'And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was . . . . For thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.'—John xvii. 5, 24. His co-existence with the Father in eternity is also asserted in the following passage:—'In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God. The same was in the beginning with God.' The word *beginning* unquestionably refers to the eternity which existed prior to created existence; and if this passage asserts the eternity of the Father, it equally asserts the eternity of the Son, for he was co-existent, he 'was in the beginning with God.' The Apostle, referring to the creation of the whole universe, visible and invisible, asserts respecting Christ, 'And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.'—Col. i. 17. But he who existed before any creature is unquestionably uncreated, and therefore eternal. We have before seen the phrase, 'THE FIRST and THE LAST,' used in the Old Testament as a periphrasis for Jehovah, expressing his eternity; and the same title we have seen repeatedly applied to Christ, and consequently expressive of *his* eternity. In Isa. ix. 6, our Lord is styled the Everlasting Father; or more properly (as אבי עד implies), the *Father of Eternity;* for the word עד signifies undefined duration—ages past and future. This agrees with the antithesis and contrast which the two natures of Christ present in the passage; thus the prophecy speaks of him, in his human nature, as a 'child,' which is contrasted with the 'MIGHTY GOD,' in his Divine nature. Then, as an infant, he is '*born*,' and, like

does not affect the argument, as eternal and unchangeable existence is the idea conveyed.

ourselves, his existence begins; but, in contrast to this, he is in his Divine nature 'the Father of Eternity,' and therefore his existence has neither beginning nor end. These contrasts are frequent in the sacred writers, and give vivacity and force to their meaning. In Micah v. 2, we have a prophecy of the same important personage, the Messiah, and of the same wonderful event, his incarnation; and here we have the same striking contrast, in reference to his two natures: 'But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting'—literally, from the days of *eternity* (מימי עולם). Here are two points of contrast: the smallness and insignificance of the city of Bethlehem are contrasted with the magnificence of the person predicted, who should be a king and ruler; and his incarnation in *time*, as an event to be dated and chronicled in the annals of men, is contrasted with the dateless and eternal ages of his past existence. 'Out of thee shall he come forth unto me, whose goings forth have been of old, from the days of eternity.' To these passages add the fact, that our Lord is emphatically denominated, as one of his expressive titles, 'THE ETERNAL LIFE;' 'This is the true God and eternal life.' If language have any definite meaning, we have the eternity of Christ clearly asserted in the scriptures adduced.

2. *Immutability* is ascribed to Jesus Christ. This is an attribute which, in an absolute sense, can be applied to Deity alone. It cannot be applied to inanimate creation, for it has changed, is ever changing, and is destined to still more important revolutions. It cannot be applied to man, for he is ever fluctuating in his nature, his purposes, and condition; nor to angels as an order of beings, for multitudes have awfully changed their character and their state—'have left their first estate, and are reserved in chains under darkness unto the great day.' But in Mal. iii. 6 God affirms, 'I am Jehovah, I change not,' clearly implying that this can be affirmed of none but himself; yet this is expressly affirmed of our Saviour. The Apostle, speaking of the works of his almighty hands, contrasts his immutability with the revolutions to which they were destined. 'They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt

thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.'—Heb. i. 11, 12. This passage, we have before seen, is a quotation from Ps. cii., and is there ascribed to Jehovah, thus proving at once that the name is expressive of his nature, and that he is Jehovah Jesus, 'the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.'—Heb. xiii. 8.

3. *Omnipotence* is ascribed to our Lord and Saviour. We have largely dwelt on this Divine attribute when noticing the names and titles given to Christ. We have shown that he is called 'THE ALMIGHTY;' that is, the Omnipotent Being whose ability to act is commensurate with his will. The Apostle ascribes to him the same attribute of unlimited power when he affirms that 'he shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working *whereby he is able even to subdue all things* unto himself.'—Phil. iii. 21. These passages demonstrate the omnipotence of Christ; but we reserve more copious observations on this subject until we come to consider those displays of power which are exhibited in his works.

4. *Omniscience* is an attribute of Jesus Christ. This attribute is declaratory of Deity, and the Scriptures speak of it as belonging to God alone. Solomon says, 'Thou, even thou only, knowest the hearts of all the children of men.'—1 Kings viii. 39. And God himself declares, 'I Jehovah search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.' The same omniscience is ascribed to the Redeemer by the Apostles. Peter appealed to his knowledge of the secrets of the human heart, and of all other things, saying, 'Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee.' St John affirms that 'Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him'—vi. 64; that is, he read the hearts of all men. St John declares that 'Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man'—ii. 24, 25. Against the omniscience of the Saviour the following passage is often adduced by the Unitarian: 'But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.'—Mark xiii. 32. These words, however, are capable of a satisfactory solution. I observe, then,

that they cannot be understood in a sense which contradicts the plain Scriptures we have already adduced in proof of Christ's omniscience, for those are parts of the Holy Scriptures, as well as this passage, and therefore a principle of interpretation must be adopted in harmony with both. Now, the idiom of the language in which Christ spoke gives us the principle required. Whether the Saviour spoke in Greek or Chaldeo-Syriac is of no importance, as the language of the New Testament is full of Hebrew idioms; that is, of the modes and usages peculiar to that language and its several dialects. Now, it is one peculiarity of that language to give verbs the sense of *causing* the action or state intended to be done or to be realized by another. For example, the verb *to know*, in the conjugation called *hiphil*, signifies to *cause another to know*, or to *make known to another*, that which you know yourself. This is a regular principle of the Hebrew language, of which hundreds of examples might be given. Thus, on the principle before us, the word ἴδω in the text, which is rendered '*to know*,' signifies *to make known*. St Paul uses the same word in the same sense when he says, 'For I determined not to know (that is, not to make known) anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.'—1 Cor. ii. 2. The context shows that this is his meaning. Paul is not speaking of his *learning* something from the Corinthians, but of his mode of *teaching* Gospel truth to them; for in the former verse he says, 'I came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, *declaring* unto you the testimony of God.' Now, in his declaring this testimony he determined *to make known* no human science or philosophy—nothing but Christ crucified—the doctrine of salvation by the cross of Christ. The sense in this passage, then, clearly is *to make known;* and the same principle requires the same sense to the same word spoken by Christ. We understand our Lord, then, to say, that as for the day and hour of the destruction of Jerusalem, or the day of judgment, it was not assigned to the ministry of either man or angel to make it known, nor even to his own ministry, but the Father himself would reveal it by its sudden and unlooked-for appearance. Thus, it was the *revelation* of the time to mankind, and not the personal knowledge of it by Christ, which is negatived in the passage.* That

* It is worthy of notice, too, that the Greek word ἴδω comes from the Hebrew יָדַע, and indeed it is the same word, both in signification and in sound.

the Redeemer himself knew the time is sustained by the whole drift of his discourse; for, in the same breath, he foretells the destruction of Jerusalem with the most circumstantial exactness, and in reference to the period itself, he declares that the present generation should not pass away until the event should be accomplished; but, beyond this, it was not compatible with God's design to make it known—to give men any previous information. As further evidence of our Lord's omniscience, he himself asserts his knowledge of the secrets of the human heart. 'And all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts.'—Rev. ii. 23. This is the same attribute which is asserted by Jehovah in Jer. xvii. 10, and is expressed in the same phraseology. It is the same attribute which Solomon declares belongs to Jehovah alone. Moreover, our Lord declares that his knowledge of the Father is co-extensive with the Father's knowledge of himself. 'As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father.'—John x. 15. From the passages adduced, the omniscience of the Saviour is asserted, in every variety of form, and in language as plain as that in which the unlimited knowledge of the Father is proclaimed.

5. *Omnipresence* is applied to the Lord Jesus. This attribute is declared to be a characteristic of Deity; hence Solomon says, 'But will God indeed dwell on the earth? behold, the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee;' and in Jer. xxiii. 24, God inquires, 'Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith Jehovah. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith Jehovah.' This exalted attribute is as expressly ascribed to the Saviour, for he it is 'that filleth all in all.'—Eph. i. 23. The Father's omnipresence is proved by his dwelling in the hearts of his people, as it is written, 'I will dwell in you, and walk in you, and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God, saith the Lord Almighty;' and the omnipresence of the Son is proved by a similar promise—'If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and WE will come unto him, and make our abode with him.'—John xiv. 23. The omnipresence of Jehovah is proved also by the gracious promise he made unto Moses—'In all places where my name is recorded, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee;' and the omnipresence of Christ is proved by a corresponding promise to his disciples in every age and place. For he has said, 'Where two or three are gathered

together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.'—Matt. xviii. 20. To all his faithful ambassadors he has also given the assurance of his presence, in every place, down to the end of time: 'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world'—xxviii. 19, 20. No language can more clearly and fully declare the omnipresence of our Lord.

We have thus shown that the attributes of eternity, immutability, omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence are ascribed to Christ in the same variety of forms as they are ascribed to the Father; if, then, these attributes prove the Deity of the Father, they necessarily establish the Deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

In the third place, we shall advance further proofs of the Deity of our Saviour by showing that the works and prerogatives of God are ascribed to him. In conducting this argument, we shall not refer to miracles, for such works have been often performed by prophets and apostles, but confine our attention to those works which are *peculiar* to God, which were never wrought by any creature, either by that creature's own natural power, or through any temporary miraculous influence from above.

1. THE CREATION OF THE UNIVERSE, AND OF ALL CREATURES DWELLING THEREIN, IS ASCRIBED TO JESUS CHRIST. Throughout the sacred volume creation is declared to be the work of the supreme God alone, and often is challenged by Jehovah as that which distinguishes his proper Deity, not only from the idols of the heathen, but from all other beings, however exalted. Thus in the first verse of the Scriptures, it is announced as a truth ever to be kept in mind, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' Nehemiah declares, 'Thou, even thou, art Jehovah alone: thou hast made the heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, the seas, and all things that are therein.' It is on this ground that the MOST HIGH asserts his claim to the supreme homage and obedience of mankind. In Isa. xl. this prerogative is maintained with overpowering eloquence and majesty. Yet this glorious work inspiration ascribes to the Son as well as the Father. The language of John, in ascribing creation to him, so closely resembles the language of Moses, that it is in the

highest degree probable the Apostle had his eye on this part of the Divine record when he commenced his Gospel with the declaration, 'In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.' In this passage creation is ascribed to our Lord in every variety of form which language will admit:—*Positively*, 'All things were made by him;' *Negatively*, 'Without him was not any thing made;' *Universally*, 'All things' were thus created by him. To evade this plain statement, the Unitarian refers it to a spiritual creation, a new state of things introduced by Christ's ministry. But this notion the context shows to be ridiculous, for in the tenth verse it is declared that the *material* world and its inhabitants were created by him; hence it is said, 'He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.' The same work is ascribed to him in the Epistle to the Hebrews—'Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands'—i. 10. In the Epistle to the Colossians this glorious work of Christ is described with greater amplitude—'For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him'—i. 16. In this passage it is shown that not only is he the originator of all things, but their PROPRIETOR; they were created 'by him and for him.' If, then, creation proves the Deity of its author—if it prove the Godhead of the Father, it clearly establishes the Godhead of the Son, for it is ascribed to him in every variety of form.*

* In order to neutralize the force of this argument for the Saviour's Deity, it has been alleged that our translation in John i. 3, 'All things were made *by* him,' is too strong for the original, and that the Greek preposition διὰ more properly denotes the instrument *through* whom a thing is done, than the *agent by* whom it is done; that, therefore, though Christ may be the *instrumental* cause, he cannot be the *efficient* cause; and in support of this view we are referred to the passage, 'By whom also he made the worlds.'—Heb. i. 2. But this criticism will not stand the test of examination; for, in the first place, διὰ, with a genitive, is evidently used for the efficient cause in numerous passages. Thus it is applied to the Father, whose efficient agency will not be disputed; hence, we read, 'God is faithful, by whom (δι' οὗ) ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son.'—1 Cor. i. 9. See also Rom. xi. 36; Heb. ii. 10, where διὰ expresses the

2. The work of preserving the universe is ascribed to the Saviour of men. The same power which created is essential to preserve; for were God to withhold his Almighty energy, the order and harmony of the universe would be destroyed. This wonderful work is ascribed to the Lord Jesus. In Heb. i. 3, he is said to 'uphold all things by the word of his power.' Nor is this spoken of him as pertaining merely to his office as Mediator, but as his original prerogative, for the passage refers to his state of existence prior to his incarnation. Indeed, the work of upholding is here united with the work of creating. The same passage which declares that he *upholds* all things affirms that he created the worlds; and, therefore, as creating the universe was a work performed ages before his incarnation, so was preserving or upholding. In Colossians the same passage which declares so emphatically that 'by him all things were created,' declares also, 'and by him all things *consist*,' and this declaration completes the statement on that subject, i. 17. But if by him all things *consist* (συνέστηκε)—are preserved, sustained, and caused to be held together in their order and harmony, it implies that his presence is co-extensive with his works, and his agency everywhere actively operating. Vast as the universe must be, as modern astronomy has demonstrated—though countless be the myriads of systems and congregated worlds which Omnipotence has scattered throughout immensity, and still more numerous the various orders of beings which inhabit them; yet all are dependent upon his care, are beheld by his eye, and sustained by his power. His presence fills the great temple of the universe, superintending, directing, and controlling the largest worlds and the minutest atoms, and his hand diffuses benefits and blessings amongst all his crea-

direct agency of the Father. If, then, the word denotes efficiency when applied to the Father, we must admit it denotes the same when applied to the Son, unless we are prepared to violate the common principles of language, to sustain a falling system. But it should be remarked that διὰ is not the only preposition employed in reference to the operation of the Saviour's power. The preposition Ἐν is used, and this, too, is expressive of immediate and efficient agency, as in Col. i. 16, 17. As to the passage, 'By whom also he made the worlds,' while this implies the agency of the Father, it does not exclude the agency of the Son, but denotes their united agency, for the work of creation is ascribed efficiently to the three persons in the glorious Trinity; and perhaps the passage implies that the agency of the Son was as in some ineffable manner especially displayed in this work.

tures. If he 'who built all things is God,' so is he who upholds and preserves them.

3. THE PARDONING OF SIN is a prerogative ascribed to Christ in common with the Father. 'Thus saith Jehovah, the Holy One, the Creator of Israel, I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions;' and this prerogative of Deity alone, is both asserted and exercised by our Saviour. True, in his incarnate state he is said to be 'exalted a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins'—Acts v. 31; but he had this prerogative before his incarnation, hence it is commanded, 'Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.'—Ps. ii. 12. Christ also exercised this prerogative visibly in his incarnate state, and during his abode on earth. Who forgave the penitent female that washed his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head? It was Jesus. Who forgave the sins of the poor man sick of the palsy? It was Jesus, who, when accused of blasphemy by the Jews, performed a miracle, to present a visible confirmation of the authority he had just assumed and exercised, and thus showed the murmuring scribes that the Son hath power on earth to forgive sins.' He still exercises this prerogative in his exaltation, for the Apostle ascribes our pardon to Christ as well as to the Father: 'Forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: *even as Christ forgave you*, so also do ye.'—Col. iii. 13. As this authority belongs to none but God, its assumption by the Saviour proves his proper Deity.

4. THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD AT THE LAST DAY is ascribed to the Son of God. That this power is declaratory of Deity is manifest from the Apostle's words: 'That we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead'—2 Cor. i. 9; and that this prerogative was exercised by our Lord, in unison with the Father, is manifest from his own assertion: 'For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.'—John v. 21. When he sojourned on earth, he raised the dead at his pleasure, issuing the mandate, 'I say unto thee, Arise,' and the dead arose at his call. On the day of judgment he will proclaim the summons, and, behold, 'all that are in the graves shall

hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.'—John v. 28, 29. The re-construction of the body, after its dissolution into its constituent elements and its multifarious combinations with other substances, is a work at least equal to creation itself, and necessarily implies the exertion of Omnipotent energy; and the Scriptures expressly refer it to such an energy—'According to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.' He, therefore, who declares himself 'The Resurrection and the Life,' declares himself to be truly and properly God.

5. THE JUDGING OF THE WORLD, AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, IS A WORK ASSIGNED TO JESUS CHRIST. This great and momentous work, this awfully solemn and dignified office, implying, as it does, not only a perfect knowledge of the Divine law, but of the character of every human being, with every event in the history of our world, with all the secret springs of human conduct, and all the involved and complicated modes of human sentiment and action, which have transpired in the myriads of our race for many thousands of years, requires such attributes and perfections as exist only in the mind of Deity. Infinite knowledge and almighty power, as well as absolute and unchangeable rectitude, are essential to this office, and hence it is ascribed to Jehovah. The Psalmist says, 'But Jehovah shall endure for ever: he hath prepared his throne for judgment. And he shall judge the world in righteousness'—ix. 7, 8. This Jehovah is the incarnate *God*, for it is declared: 'We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, whether they be good or bad.'—2 Cor. v. 10. Our Lord himself says, 'The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son;' and yet John, in giving a prophetic description of the awful day of judgment, says, 'I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.'—Rev. xx. 12. Thus Christ is declared to be the Judge of all; but this Judge is called Jehovah God, and therefore Christ is truly God. If it be said that the office of judge is assigned to the Saviour especially, because he is our Mediatorial Governor, we grant it; but then the fact of this

office being assigned to him implies a pre-existent capacity to sustain it, and that capacity itself is as decided a proof of his Deity as any work he has performed. While infinite powers qualify him for the work, the fact of his having become incarnate, and taken upon him our nature, presents a special reason why He should be our Judge, and declares both the equity and mercy of the Divine proceedings. To weaken the force of our argument it has been replied, that the office of judging is assigned to the saints, for it is said that 'the saints shall judge the world.' The saints shall judge in the sense of condemning it by their holy and obedient conduct, as the faith of Noah condemned the antediluvian world for its unbelief; but this is irrelevant. If the objector mean that the saints shall take the place of the Supreme Judge, then it becomes absurd. It is the Supreme Judge of quick and dead who is spoken of, and this is no other than the Incarnate God. It has further been alleged that the Judge is described as a *man*, as where the Apostle states, 'He will judge the world in righteousness by that *man* whom he hath ordained.'—Acts xvii. 31. This is true, but the humanity of Christ does not exclude his Divinity, any more than his Divinity excludes his humanity, since he is both God and man united. It is the Incarnate God, Jehovah Jesus, who shall judge the world, and appoint to all souls their eternal destiny. To the righteous he will say, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;' but to the wicked he will say, 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.'

6. Divine worship is ascribed to our Lord and Saviour. The Scriptures are very express and emphatic in denouncing idolatry, and the design of the Gospel is to crush every system of idolatry, and establish the pure spiritual worship of Jehovah throughout the world. 'It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'—Matt. iv. 10. The principle on which Jehovah demands our homage is that he is our Creator; and the principle on which he forbids our worship to others is, that they are not our creators. 'O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before Jehovah our Maker. For he is our God; and we are the people of his pasture.'—Ps. xcv. From these and a multitude

of passages, it is manifest that no being but God our Maker is to be worshipped, and that worship to any other is idolatry. It matters not how exalted in intelligence and moral worth a creature may be; he is not to be worshipped, because he is not our maker. Accordingly, creature worship is made a subject of the most terrible denunciations of Divine wrath, and we always find holy men not only avoiding its practice, as the greatest evil, but resolutely resisting it when, on account of their piety or their miraculous powers, worship was offered to them. When Cornelius fell down before Peter to worship him, 'Peter took him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man.'—Acts x. 26. When Paul and Barnabas were at Lystra, the priest of the city brought oxen and garlands to worship them; but the Apostles, trembling at the idea of such impiety, rent their clothes, and ran into the midst of the people, crying out, 'Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein.' This fact further illustrates our principle that the CREATOR alone is to be worshipped. Even the angels, though so highly exalted, repel all attempts to worship them, as an encroachment upon the prerogative of God. When St John, overpowered by the bright form of the angelic being who stood before him, was about to do him homage, that celestial messenger quickly interrupted him, saying, 'See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets: worship God.'—Rev. xxii. 9. Yet the sacred book which so strictly prohibits *creature* worship as idolatry, and furnishes these examples of sacredly guarding the Divine prerogative from intrusion and usurpation, by men or by angels, expressly commands the worship of the Saviour. Our Lord himself has declared, 'That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.' Now the honour which, in a peculiar sense, belongs to God, is, as we have seen, Divine worship; yet here we are required to honour the Son, even as we honour the Father. The sense in which Christ is to be honoured as the Father may be gathered, not merely from this passage, but from the practice of the disciples and apostles.

Passing by the numerous instances in which Christ was worshipped while on earth, we shall notice some examples of

is worship since his exaltation. When the disciples had witnessed his ascension, it is recorded that 'they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy.'—Luke xxiv. 52. The early Christians worshipped him in every variety of form, and one of their distinguishing appellations was, They who call upon the name of Christ.—Acts ix. 14. Thus St Paul commences his Epistle to the Corinthians, 'Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with ALL THAT IN EVERY PLACE CALL UPON THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD, BOTH THEIRS AND OURS.' Thus not only at Corinth, but '*in every place*,' this was their distinction.

It is worthy of notice, too, that the primitive saints called upon Christ's name in every form of address peculiar to worship. They sung hymns of adoration to him as to God. When examined before the tribunal of Pliny, and put to the torture for their profession, they affirmed that their custom was on a stated day to meet together early, before it was light, and sing a hymn to Christ, as to God.* They also prayed to Christ for all kinds of blessings. They prayed to him for salvation. When Ananias was sent by Divine appointment to instruct the penitent Saul of Tarsus in the way of salvation, he directed him to 'be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord.'—Acts xxii. 16. They prayed to him for deliverance in tribulation. When Paul was tried with the affliction figuratively called 'a thorn in the flesh,' he besought the Lord thrice for deliverance, and received from him the gracious answer, 'My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness.' 'Most gladly therefore,' says the Apostle, 'will I glory in mine infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.' The saints prayed to him for grace or favour. Many times the Apostle Paul uses the following prayer: 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.' Such a prayer occurs in each of the following texts:—Rom. xvi. 20, 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 23; Gal. vi. 18; Eph. i. 2; Phil. iv. 23; 1 Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; 2 Tim. iv. 22. Paul writing to Timothy, uses the following prayer:—1 Tim. i. 2:—'Grace, mercy, and peace, from God our Father and

* 'Affirmabant autem . . . . quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire: carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere.'—*Plin., Epis.* 97.

Jesus Christ our Lord.' Now, what are the blessings which are here sought? The Apostle asks for mercy; he asks for grace, he asks for peace. And these three blessings comprehend all spiritual blessings:—mercy, to pardon; grace, to sanctify; and peace, as the happy result of these important blessings. From whom does the Apostle seek these blessings? He sought them from God, even our Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ. And how does he seek them? He sought them by an act of worship—by prayer to the Father and to Christ, as the united source of mercy, grace, and peace! In the Epistles alone we have about twenty-eight instances in which our Lord is thus solemnly addressed.

The saints prayed to Christ the Lord for both temporal and spiritual blessings. 'Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you. And the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you: to the end he may stablish your hearts unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.'—1 Thess. iii. 11—13. In this prayer the Father is put before the Son, but in the following prayer the Lord Jesus is placed before the Father. 'Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.'—2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. Thus Christ is united with the Father as the Object of prayer, as the Fountain of blessing, and the Bestower of all grace; therefore, if by prayer the Apostles worshipped the Father, they equally worshipped and honoured the Son. The teachings of Christ to his disciples authorized the conduct of the saints in praying to himself: for he commands us to supplicate him for blessings, and promises to bestow them in answer to our prayers. Wherever we assemble he has promised to be in our midst, and has said, 'Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do;' and again, 'If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it.'—John xiv. 13, 14. Therefore the Apostles, in praying to Christ for all kinds of blessings, were acting in exact conformity with his own gracious requirements and promises. The expiring Stephen prayed to the Lord Jesus in behalf of

his murderers, and commended his departing spirit to his Divine care: 'And they stoned Stephen, invoking (or praying), and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.' Moreover, it is implied that these solemn acts of worship were performed by the dying saint under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; for it is said that Stephen was full of the Holy Ghost.—Acts vii. 55, 59, 60.

The saints worshipped the Lord Jesus not only in prayer, but in various forms of thanksgiving and praise. Take the following examples:—'But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory both now and for ever.'—2 Peter iii. 18. 'And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.'—2 Tim. iv. 18. 'Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood . . . . . to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.'—Rev. i. 5, 6. The Lord Jesus is also worshipped by glorified saints in heaven as well as by the Church on earth. 'After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, AND UNTO THE LAMB.'—Rev. vii. 9, 10. Thus, in that bright world where no obscurity can dim the vision, where no prejudice can warp the judgment, and where no corrupt usage can vitiate the heart—in that celestial state where men see as they are seen, and know as they are known—where they dwell in God's immediate presence, and are illumined by the beams of his Divine glory, Christ is worshipped and adored by the whole Church of God.

The Redeemer, moreover, is worshipped by all the holy angels. 'And when he bringeth in the First-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.'—Heb. i. 6. This command is obeyed by all orders of angelic hosts. We have before observed that, when Isaiah saw Jehovah-Christ in his pre-existent glory, he heard the adorations which seraphs rendered to him, exclaiming, 'Holy, holy holy, is Jehovah of hosts.' St John was favoured with a similar view

of the heavenly world, and he beheld all the celestial hierarchy united with glorified saints in worshipping God and the Lamb. He saw *τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα, the four living ones,* and the elders fall down 'before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood. . . . . And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the living ones and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.' This praise, so exalted and yet so just and proper, is represented as being united in by all animated existence—that is, all creatures show forth his praise and glory: 'And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever.' The chorus is then completed by the loud Amen. 'And the four living ones said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped.'—Rev. v. 8—14. These are some of our proofs for the worship of Christ; and we know not how evidence more clear and striking can be conveyed in human language.

We are aware that our opponents allege that there is a twofold kind of worship—one of which is mere civil respect, or obeisance; the other religious homage. It is true that the terms used both in the Hebrew and Greek language are capable of this twofold application. But this admission detracts nothing from the force of our argument, for the following reasons:—The Scriptures, which require worship to be rendered to Christ, never intimate that mere civil respect is intended, and never caution us against giving him that worship which is religious and supreme; on the contrary, it is *religious and spiritual worship only* that is required and commanded. Indeed, to talk of civil respect in heaven is to speak foolishly. The passages we have adduced as expressive of worship to Christ refer

to spiritual worship only, and that of the highest order. The attitudes, the language, and the sentiments all express it. Combined with solemn prostration we have the most devout, hallowed, and reverential breathings of the heart in supplication, in intercession, in thanksgiving, and in devotion; the worship, too, of heaven as well as of earth, of angels as well as men. The revered and holy name of the Saviour is united with that of the Father in the same act of homage. *From both* the same blessings are sought, and *to both* the same lofty praises are ascribed. It is the homage which both angels and holy men shrunk from accepting, because it belonged to none but God. The alleged distinction, therefore, between *civil* respect and *religious* worship is totally inapplicable, and can only be regarded as a miserable attempt to evade the force of an unwelcome truth. The same argument which would reduce the worship of the Son to civil respect would inevitably reduce the worship of the Father to mere civil respect, and thus exclude all religious worship from both earth and heaven.

Besides, this distinction, which the Unitarian seeks to establish, is as impracticable in religion as it is unscriptural in theory. Socinus pretended to render our Lord an inferior kind of homage, and taught his followers to do the same; but they refused. Hence we find this teacher complaining 'that he could not prevail upon his refractory disciples to worship Christ at all.' They were not likely. Their master had degraded him to a mere creature, and they knew worship belonged to none but the Creator; how, then, could they worship Christ? This fact plainly shows that Unitarianism is not merely a speculative error, but fraught with practical disobedience—as repugnant to Christian *precept* as to Christian *principle*. It is a theory which is incompatible with the common duties and obligations we owe to the Saviour, and its reception unfits the mind to unite in the anthems which saints and angels ascribe to His Blessed Name. It has no sympathy with the glowing emotions which inspire the minds of the Church either in earth or heaven. It seals the lips in silence, while the glorified praise him 'with a loud voice;' or it breathes a harsh and sullen discord to the song of 'Worthy is the Lamb.' Unitarianism is hostile to Christianity. We may close this branch of our argument by observing, that since all creature worship is denounced

as idolatry—since we are expressly commanded to worship no being but God himself, and yet are required to worship Christ, the conclusion is inevitable that Christ is God.

7. In conformity with the solemn rites of visible worship, such as we have seen are performed to the honour of our Lord by angels and men, we find that the *Sentiments which constitute the spirit of worship are constantly exercised towards him by the inspired writers.* True worship is the expression of sentiment and feeling. It is the utterance of confidence, gratitude, love, and the various pious emotions of a regenerated heart, and there is no worship apart from these. These sentiments, with Christ as their appropriate object, live and breathe in the sacred pages.

The Apostles TRUSTED IN HIM—*committing to his sacred charge their eternal interests.* In Isa. xxvi. 4 it is commanded, 'Trust ye in the Lord for ever: for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength.' Thus trust in Jehovah is a religious duty, and the same trust is to be exercised in Christ, for it is declared, 'In his name shall the Gentiles trust.'—Matt. xii. 21. The word ἐλπίζω signifies not simply belief, but *trust, hope, dependence;* and this word, which is applied by the Septuagint to Jehovah, in the Old Testament, is applied by the Evangelist to the Saviour in the New. This holy and religious dependence upon Christ was one of the principal features in the character of the first Christians, and originated one of the appellations given to them, as St Paul says, 'That we should be to the praise of his glory, *who first trusted in Christ.*'—Eph. i. 12. The Church is described as rejoicing in God as the object of her confidence, exclaiming, 'Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust and not be afraid, for the Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song. He also is become my salvation.' And Paul, with the same satisfaction and joy, says, respecting Christ, 'I am not ashamed, for I know *in whom I have trusted.*' Trusting in God affords immovable security; hence the Psalmist declares, 'They that trust in Jehovah shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth for ever;' and Paul expresses the same assurance of safety from his confidence in Christ: for in the prospect of martyrdom he exclaims, 'I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.' It is manifest that this

confidence—this solemn act of committing the soul's eternal interests into the hand of Christ, implies a *religious* trust which can properly be exercised towards no being but Jehovah. It is the sacred homage of the heart to the almighty power and unchangeable faithfulness of the Creator. Therefore, since this confidence in Christ is a religious duty which we owe to him, it is a proper acknowledgment of his Deity. Moreover, such a confidence exercised towards a creature is denounced as idolatry, and entails a curse: for thus says Jehovah, 'Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm;' but those who exercised this confidence in Christ are pronounced blessed: 'Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. *Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.*'—Jer. xvii. 5 Ps. ii. 12. We have here a demonstration of the proper Deity of our Lord.

Love to Christ is also required as a duty, and is the genuine fruit of experimental Christianity. The Saviour declares, 'He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and manifest myself unto him.' This passage clearly shows what kind of love is claimed by our Lord: not merely the approval and admiration due to a philanthropist, or the esteem we cherish for a friend, or the affection we owe to the brethren: but a Divine love—a love supreme in its character—a religious duty—a love which is the chief ingredient in worship—a love which is the grand principle of obedience, and which, therefore, belongs to none but God. 'If ye love me, keep my commandments.' This love to Christ is the spontaneous effusion of a soul pardoned through his grace, and overwhelmed with gratitude and a consciousness of its obligations. When our compassionate Lord thrice proposed the tender inquiry, 'Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?' the restored and pardoned disciple gratefully and eagerly replied, 'Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee.' This profession of love was accepted by Christ as his due, and the command was enjoined, 'Feed my lambs,' 'Feed my sheep.' When the penitent female had received his mercy, she 'washed his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head.' What a graphic personification of tenderness,

adoration, and love! Yet our Lord, so far from condemning her conduct as idolatrous, or her affection as excessive, commended it as appropriate and just. 'She loved much, for she had much forgiven.' It was Jesus who bestowed her pardon, who accepted her love, and who bid her depart in peace. The Pharisees murmured at his conduct as an usurpation of God's prerogative, but his reply vindicated the authority he had assumed, by showing that he had a right both to grant the pardon he bestowed and to receive the homage the penitent presented. This woman's tears were in unison with the heavenly anthem—'Worthy is the Lamb:' they glistened with the same emotions, and her actions declared the same sentiments.

The writings of the Apostles are impregnated with these sentiments, and they are expressed in every variety of form. 'Unto you which believe he is precious,' says one disciple; and, exclaims another, 'God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.' Their love was so ardent and intense that it was their ruling passion, their governing principle, raising them superior to all earthly considerations, and inspiring a holy scorn for everything that competed with Christ for the throne of their hearts. 'But what things were gain unto me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ.' Reproach, for his sake, love converted into honour, poverty into riches, sufferings into happiness; and death in its most horrid forms, endured for him, was sweeter than life without him. 'Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt.' The Apostles, when beaten before the council, rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name; and when called to martyrdom, exulted in it as the highest honour they could receive, and the highest tribute they could give to their adorable Saviour and Lord. 'I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.' 'For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain; having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better.' 'In nothing shall I be ashamed,

but with all boldness, as always, so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death.' Such are the sentiments which abound in the apostolic writings, and such are expressive of *supreme* affection and adoration—of the most devoted love which a human being can possess. They loved nothing but in reference to Christ, and nothing in comparison with him. They loved him with all their hearts; and although this affection must be idolatrous if presented to any being but God, yet it is such as Christ expressly commands, saying, 'He that loveth father and mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me.' Thus, our affection for Christ is to surpass all others: it must be supreme; it must be the spring of all obedience; it is, therefore, plainly that affection enjoined in the following precept, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength;' and this love is the fulfilling of the law. Therefore, unless idolatry be a duty, the appropriation of this love to Christ is a clear and emphatic declaration that he is truly and properly God. The possession of this love to Christ is the bond of union to the saints, the sacred badge by which they are distinguished—'Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity;' while its absence is the sign of degeneracy, and the precursor of ruin. 'If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha;' that is, let him be accursed; our Lord cometh. While the preceding arguments prove the proper Deity of our Lord,

8. The Scriptures expressly assert him to be equal to the Father in dignity and glory. The Apostle Paul, exhorting Christians to cherish humility and a self-sacrificing love for one another, says, 'Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.'—Phil. ii. 5—8. Much laboured criticism has been employed on this passage to deprive it of its plain, unequivocal testimony to our Lord's supreme

Divinity. It has been put on the rack to distort its obvious meaning, and compel it to speak in harmony with the Unitarian dogma, but in vain. The grammatical structure of the passage, and the context, both resist all such attempts. The exhortation of the Apostle infallibly guides us in the interpretation of the passage. He is enjoining upon believers the duty of cherishing an humble, benevolent spirit, a spirit that would resign personal advantages for the good of others; and this duty he enforces by referring to the example of Christ. 'Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery (or usurpation) to be equal with God,' yet voluntarily condescended to a lower state, and finally died upon the cross for our salvation. Thus the passage refers to three things, namely—to what our Lord was in his pre-existent state; to the glory and honour to which he was then entitled; and the humiliation and suffering to which he submitted. In his pre-existent state, that is, prior to his incarnation, *he was in the form of God* (ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων). What is meant by this phrase—'the form of God'—is manifest from the clause which follows it: he 'took upon him the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.' Thus, these phrases, 'the form of God' and 'the form of a servant,' stand in contrast with each other; and what is meant by the *form* of a servant determines what is meant by the *form* of God. Now, we know that Christ became a servant, not in *appearance* merely, but in *reality;* even as he was a man not in *likeness* only, but *truly* and *properly* a man, born of a woman, and made like unto his brethren. Since, then, the phrase, μορφὴ δούλου, *the form of a servant*, means *really* and *properly* the condition of a servant, so the corresponding phrase, μορφὴ Θεοῦ,* *form of God*, means *truly* and *properly* God. He was, therefore, as truly God in his pre-existent state, as he was truly

* While the antithesis of the passage shows that this is the true meaning of the word, μορφὴ Θεοῦ, *form of God*, additional evidence might be furnished by showing that the word μορφὴ is sometimes used by Greek authors to denote the *essential form*, or *nature itself*, of the thing intended. Schleusner explains it, '*Per metonymiam ipsa natura et essentia alicujus rei*'—that is, it means the nature itself and essence of anything. He gives several classical authorities and references, and adds, '*Sic quoque legitur in Novo Testamento.* Phil. ii. 6. *Ubi Christus dicitur* ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, *ad designandam sublimiorem ipsius naturam.*' So also it is read in the New Testament, where Christ is said to exist in the form of God, to denote his superior nature.

a man and a servant in his incarnate state. Moreover, as the word ὑπάρχων denotes existence, it implies that his Deity, or *being in the form of God*,' was essential and eternal ; and this corresponds exactly to the declaration of St John—' In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God.' The passage declares also the honours and prerogatives which were eternally his due : ' He thought it not robbery (or *usurpation*) to be equal with God ;' that is, his claim to these glories involved no trespass upon the prerogatives and honours of the Father or the Holy Spirit.* Yet, for a time he laid these honours aside, he waived his right to them by veiling his glory in human flesh. It is not implied that he laid aside his Divinity, but the glories and honours due to it : he cheerfully obscured them for a time, out of love to fallen men. He made himself of no reputation (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε), he emptied himself ; that is, as the passage goes on to state, he united his Godhead to the nature of humanity ; for he took upon him the form of a servant, and was found in the likeness of man, ministering and toiling for the temporal and spiritual welfare of our race ; and finally, he submitted himself to the most painful and ignominious death—the death of the cross.

Thus the passage accords with the numerous scriptures which assert the glory and dignity of our Lord prior to his incarnation—the glory which he had with the Father before the world was. It accords with the frequent allusions made to his boundless grace and amazing condescension, in that ' though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich.' It gives point and energy to the Apostle's exhortation to pure, disinterested, and self-sacrificing love to our brethren ; and presents the most affecting and powerful illustration of this duty in the example of our Lord. But the Unitarian theory divests the Apostle's argument of all power, and renders the Saviour's example totally irrelevant. On the supposition that Christ was a mere man, when had he any riches or glory to lay aside, and in what did his condescension and humility consist ? In his human nature he was always

* Whether we take the common translation, or that adopted by Dr Stuart, who renders οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, *he did not seek to retain* his glory, the evidence of Christ's Divinity is the same in this passage. In either interpretation it is manifest that our Lord waived his right to honours which were naturally his due.

poor; his birthplace was a stable, and his bed a manger; what sacrifice of honour or wealth, then, did he make in becoming the Messiah? Moses refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and abandoned his connection with the palace and the throne of Egypt: here was a real sacrifice for the honour of God; for though Moses *was* rich he voluntarily became poor. The Apostle Paul also relinquished emoluments and honours for Christ, and counted all things but loss for his sake: here again was a real sacrifice. But if the Messiah were only a man, in what does his amazing condescension and humility appear? Was it a mark of humility in a poor peasant becoming the messenger of God, the revealer of his truth, the chief of his prophets, the Saviour of the world, and the Head of the Church? Was this to make himself of no reputation? Could human origin be more humble than that which he had as a man? Could any reputation or honour be so exalted as that to which he was raised? His course was one of elevation, not of depression; of continually increasing dignity, not of condescension. Besides, Christ demanded honour, and said that 'all men should honour him even as they honoured the Father.' If he had no claim to this honour, he must have been proud, not humble: he must have set up false pretensions to honour, and usurped the prerogatives of God! The allusion of the Apostle, therefore, to Christ's divesting himself of dignity is, on the Socinian theory, inexplicable. Had Paul referred to the sacrifices involved in his own example, or that of Moses, we could have understood him; but his allusion to Christ's example must be irrelevant and absurd. Moreover, on the supposition that Christ was an angel, even of the highest order, the passage is still without force or consistency. For in what respect can the highest angel in heaven be said to exist '*in the form of God*,' or be entitled to claim an equality with God? The most exalted seraph is but a creature, limited, dependent, imperfect, and at an infinite distance from the perfections and glory of the Creator. Nor would it be an act of condescension for such a dignified being to take the place of the Messiah. On the contrary, it would confer dignity and honour upon the most glorious creature in the universe to perform the work, to sustain the office, to bear the titles, and receive the homage of the Saviour. Thus, the Unitarian interpretation is equally repugnant to the

matical structure of the passage, to the common sense of Apostle, and to the whole tenor of the Scripture, and is fore to be rejected as a perversion of the Word of God. interpret the text by the common laws of language, admit natural and obvious sense which is upon its surface, and ve rything is clear, the context is in harmony, and the argument of the Apostle is full of propriety and cogency. The Great nd Eternal God humbled himself to take upon him our nature, o dwell upon earth, to become the teacher, the example, the ervant of men; and in that nature finally died to save us from verlasting wrath. Herein is condescension; herein is love; nd hence our duty to humility and devoted affection for the rethren is enforced by the weight of his own self-denying and umble example—therefore, 'let this mind be in you, which was lso in Christ Jesus.'

If it be demanded from us to show how God could thus umble himself, we reply, the demand involves a false and unhristian principle; for it implies that our duty to believe is nly co-extensive with our ability to comprehend and explain. But the obligation of faith arises from the testimony of God, nd we believe what he declares, because we are assured that e cannot be deceived himself, and that he will not deceive thers. The fact of our Lord's incarnation the apostles both elieved and taught, though they make no attempt to explain . If it be alleged that the Deity is declared unchangeable, nd therefore the doctrine involves an absolute impossibility; e reply, that Christ *is* declared unchangeable, as we have ready shown; and if the Unitarian admits this to be an attriute peculiar to Deity, he must, on his own principle, admit hrist to be God, and thus the controversy on that subject is an end. As to the objection that the unchangeable nature of e Divine Being forbids the possibility of his incarnation and nsequent humiliation, we conceive that this objection is elevant; for the Scriptures do not teach that our Lord, in coming incarnate, parted with anything essential to his vine Nature, or that by becoming man he ceased to be God. ey teach that in some manner he resigned such honours and ories as were due to him as God—that for a season those ories were overshadowed and obscured. The bright orb of y may be obscured by clouds, or concealed, as in an eclipse,

but its nature is not changed by the event. A prince, for the welfare of his subjects, may lay aside his robes, and assume the humble condition of a peasant, but that condescension does not change his nature. Though his honour as a potentate is obscured or suspended, he is not deprived of his nature as a man, nor his relationship to his father annulled, nor his claim to resume his princely honours abolished. So the condescension of our Lord, the Prince of Life and Glory, involved no change in what was essential to his Deity. Though his glory was so deeply veiled, and his condition so greatly humbled, that he was born of a woman, was made flesh, was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, despised, rejected, and crucified, he was still truly and properly God.

9. Intimately connected with the argument derived from the condescension and disinterested love of Christ in giving himself, *there is another derived from the exhibition of the Father's love.* The gift of the Lord Jesus is described in the Holy Scriptures as the most glorious display of the Father's benevolence, and all the powers of language are employed and exhausted in setting it forth. The Saviour is denominated 'The unspeakable gift:' and the bestowment of this gift is an expression of Divine goodness which finds no parallel. 'God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' 'In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.' 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.' So marvellous is this display of love, that it is a subject of inquiry and wonder to angelic minds. At the Redeemer's birth, those celestial spirits left their thrones of bliss, and, hovering over the scene where the event took place, proclaimed its glad tidings, and sung, 'Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, and good-will toward men.' This love is a mystery into which they desire to look, and they unite with the redeemed around the throne in celebrating its riches. All these facts and statements argue the supreme dignity of the gift bestowed. If Christ is a mere man, the event would be stripped of all that is marvellous and extraordinary; for God had given many other men as well as

him. Those who contend that Christ was not more than a man will surely admit that apostles and prophets were not less than men, yet *they* were given or devoted to the welfare of the world as well as He; and with less honours and rewards were subjected to longer labours, and equal bodily sufferings. Why, then, should the Scriptures abound with passages distinguishing the gift of Christ in such a pre-eminent form? and why such praises be lavished upon the love it displays? Such passages are worse than devoid of meaning; they are calculated to mislead and deceive. Besides, even on the supposition that Christ is an angel, the Scriptures are involved in the same obscurity and inconsistency. For there is no angel emphatically called *The Son of God*,' 'For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?' Nor would the gift of an angel be such an extraordinary manifestation of God's tender love, for it would only be his gift of one creature in behalf of other creatures.

But the great truth so clearly revealed and firmly established that Christ is God takes away every discrepancy. The dignity of his person shows the greatness of the mystery, while his relationship as the Son declares the immensity of the Father's compassion and love for our world. Had he swept immensity of its shining jewels, the gift would have been inadequate, and the expression of his love poor, compared with the gift of Christ. Had a legion of angels become incarnate, and each passed through a life of obedience and a death of pain and ignominy, the depth and intensity of God's love would not have been equally displayed. 'He spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all.' This is the wonder! Such gift may well excite the astonishment of angels; may well form the theme of every page in the New Testament; may well become the burden of our song throughout eternity.

The evidences for our Lord's supreme Divinity are so numerous and diversified, that volumes might be written upon the subject without exhausting the materials furnished by the inspired writings. Our confined limits necessarily put a restraint upon our pen; but a few more proofs must be introduced, and then some additional passages adduced by the Unitarian must be examined.

10. *In a variety of passages the Saviour is set forth as having*

a common proprietorship with the Father. We have already noticed several passages which teach that 'all things were created by him and for him'—that he is their Proprietor and Owner as well as 'their Maker'—their End as well as their Author. In harmony with these assertions, our Lord declares, 'All things that the Father hath are mine;' and again, addressing the Father, he says, 'All mine are thine, and thine are mine.'—John xvi. 15; xvii. 10. As this common proprietorship with the Father extends to *all* things, of course it includes those which are sacred and religious, as well as those of nature and providence. Hence Christ is called *Lord of the Temple*, and *Lord of the Sabbath*, in the same sense as those terms are applicable to the Father—that is, they are properly his own, and devoted to his glory. The passages ascribing these Divine prerogatives to Christ are important, and worthy of some special consideration.

He is 'Lord of the Temple.' Our Lord himself asserted his own supreme Divinity when, in reply to the captious Pharisees, he said, 'But I say unto you, That in this place is One greater than the temple.'—Matt. xii. 6. He was greater than the temple, because he was its Proprietor, its Lord, and the object to whose worship it was devoted. As Dr Clarke observes, 'The Jews esteemed nothing greater than the temple, except that God who was worshipped in it. Christ, by asserting he was greater than the temple, asserts that he is God.' This view is fully established by the passage which asserts him to be the Lord and owner of the temple. Jehovah, speaking by the prophet Malachi, says, 'Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His Temple' —iii. 1. That this applies to Christ is sufficiently evident from the context; but it is placed beyond the possibility of dispute by the fact that *four* times have the Evangelists applied this passage to our Saviour. Thus, then, Christ, who was to come, is here denominated 'The Lord' (a name which hundreds of times is applied to Deity), *and the Temple is said to be* 'His Temple.' A moment's consideration will make it obvious that the phrase 'His Temple' implies that He is the Deity to whose worship the temple was dedicated. In Acts xix. we read of the temple of Diana, by which we understand the temple in

hich the idol Diana was worshipped. In like manner the emple of Jerusalem is, in a multitude of passages, called God's emple, because devoted to his worship. The Psalmist says, Jehovah is in his holy temple.'—Ps. xi. 4. On the day the rst temple was dedicated to God's service it was filled with his lory, and the shekinah, or cloud of glory, abode between the herubim over the mercy-seat as a visible symbol of Jehovah's resence in his own temple. Thus the temple was his—built for is honour, devoted to his worship, and actually possessed and habited by his presence and glory. Now, in the same sense, he temple is said to be Christ's temple, and this most ematically asserts his Godhead.

Moreover, it is declared in the prophecy by Malachi, that hrist should come to 'His temple.' By the prophet Haggai so this event is predicted, and it is there said that the coming the Saviour should fill the temple with glory. 'For thus ith Jehovah of hosts; I will shake all nations, and the Desire all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, th Jehovah of hosts. . . . . The glory of this latter house all be greater than of the former, saith Jehovah of hosts' ii. 6, 7, 9. This was spoken in reference to the second mple, which in several respects was inferior to the former. was not so richly decorated, and it was deficient in several red things. The ark of the covenant, the tables of the law, itten by the finger of God, the pot of manna, and Aaron's l that budded, had been lost, and the shekinah had departed, l was never restored; yet with all these defects it was fore- l that the second temple should be more glorious than the ner. The prophecy of Malachi explains this, declaring that who was 'the Lord of the temple' was to come to it in son. In the first temple he had appeared *typically* in the ud of the shekinah; in the second he came *actually* and *sonally*. He came to it, and there daily taught the great ths of salvation. But just before he suffered he entered temple in such a solemn and remarkable manner as afforded ost striking fulfilment of prophecy. As Zechariah had told, he enters the city riding upon an ass; the way is wed with garments and branches of palm-trees; the multitude laim him the long-expected heir of David's throne—the sed One coming in the name of the Lord; and they rend

the skies with the exulting acclamation of 'Hosannah in the highest!' The multitude increases—the whole city is moved, the royal procession passes through the public streets to the temple, and immediately its sacred porticoes resound with the song, 'Hosannah to the Son of David, hosannah in the highest!' At this instant he cast out the buyers and sellers, he healed the blind and the lame; and, when the envious scribes and priests were displeased with the authority he exercised and the homage he received, he asserted his right to both, saying, 'It is written, My HOUSE shall be called a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves;' adding, that if the disciples had withheld their praises, the very stones of the temple would immediately cry out—if *men* refused his homage in the temple, the stones of the building would assert his authority and dignity. Comparing these facts with prophecy, we clearly see how Jesus was Lord of the temple, and how his coming invested it with superior glory; so that the former glory had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelled. The temple was his. He came to take possession of it as his own, and publicly approved of the tribute presented to him there. If, then, that glorious Being who calls the temple his own, and to whose worship it was consecrated, is Jehovah the true God, so is the Saviour of the world, for the temple was his.

In the same manner he declared himself to be THE LORD ALSO OF THE SABBATH. The sanctimonious Pharisees murmured at the permission the Saviour had given to his disciples, when pressed by hunger, to pluck a few ears of corn on the Sabbath day, and he replied by vindicating their conduct, and asserting his own Divine authority, saying, 'The Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day.' We ask, could any mere creature, whether man or angel, make such an assertion, and claim such a prerogative? Impossible; for the dignity and authority here claimed are such as belong to none but Jehovah God. A glance at the institution and object of the Sabbath will at once make this apparent. The author of the Sabbath is Jehovah, the Creator of the world; and the appropriate name of this day is, in Scripture language, '*The Sabbath of the Lord God*.' It was instituted by Jehovah to commemorate the completion of the great work of creation, and by his special command and ordinance was consecrated as a day of rest from worldly toil, and of devotion

religious worship. Hence it is recorded, 'And God blessed
e seventh day, and sanctified it: because in it he had rested
om all his work which he had created and made.' Afterwards
e find it commanded, 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it
ly. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the
venth day is the Sabbath of Jehovah thy God.'—Gen. ii. 3;
xod. xx. 8—10. We see, then, what it is to be Lord of the
bbath: it is to be its Author and its Object. This glorious
eing declares himself in the passage before us 'Jehovah our
od;' and therefore Christ, by declaring himself Lord of the
bbath, proclaims himself 'Jehovah our God.'

Moreover, the title he assumes, as Lord of the Sabbath,
esents another irrefragable proof of his being the *Creator*
the Universe. For he who instituted the Sabbath is the
thor of all creation. The narrative of Moses plainly shows
at the creation of the world and the appointment of the Sab-
th are ascribed to the same glorious Being. It tells us that
was he who rested from all his work which he had created
d made, who blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, and
dained it a day of sacred rest and religious worship. Thus
rist, by declaring himself Lord of the Sabbath, identifies
nself as Lord of creation and Maker of all worlds. This
autifully accords with the many other passages adduced in
ich it is stated that by Christ 'all things were made.' For
as St John affirms, it was our Lord who made the world and
things, it must be he also who, as Moses says, rested from all
work on the seventh day, and who appointed that day for
own religious worship. Finally, our Lord's declaration that
is 'Lord of the Sabbath' is in perfect harmony with his
ng '*Lord of the temple;*' for both were equally devoted to
Divine glory. If the temple was the consecrated *place*,
Sabbath was the consecrated *time* for the worship of God;
he who was the Lord of the one must be Lord of the other
; and he who was Lord of both must be the proper object
hat worship for which both were instituted. Thus, text
to text, and truth to truth, like the stones of an arch geo-
rically set; and all combine to sustain the keystone of our
our's Divinity and Godhead: while that keystone gives
sion, consistency, proportion, and strength to the whole
e of inspired truth.

11. *Numerous passages of Scripture prove that Christ is the Jehovah who often revealed himself to men under the Old Testament dispensation.* This truth is so obvious that it has been held by orthodox divines in all ages. Justin Martyr (A. D. 150) says, 'Our Christ conversed with Moses out of the bush in the appearance of fire.' Again, he says, 'The Jews are justly reproved for imagining that the Father of all things spake to Moses, when indeed it was the Son of God, who is called the "Angel" and the "Messenger" of the Father. He formerly appeared in the form of fire, and without a human shape, to Moses and other prophets; but now being made a man,' &c. Irenæus (A. D. 180) says, 'The Scripture is full of the Son of God's appearing; sometimes to talk and eat with Abraham; at other times to instruct Noah about the building of the ark; at another time to seek Adam; at another time to bring down judgment upon Sodom; then again to direct Jacob in the way; and again to converse with Moses out of the bush.' Tertullian (A. D. 200) says, 'It was the Son who judged men from the beginning, destroying that lofty tower, and confounding their languages, punishing the whole world with a flood of waters, and raining fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah, the Lord pouring it down from the Lord; for he always descended to hold converse with men, from Adam even to the patriarchs and prophets, in visions and dreams, in dark sentences, always preparing his way from the beginning.' Clemens Alexandrinus (A. D. 206), speaking of our Lord as a Divine teacher, says that he 'appeared to Abraham, to Jacob, wrestled with him, and lastly manifested himself to Moses.' Again, 'Christ gave the world the law of nature, and the written law of Moses.' Origen (A. D. 250) says, 'My Lord Jesus Christ descended to the earth more than once. He came down to Esaias, to Moses, and to every one of the prophets.' Again, 'That our blessed Saviour did sometimes become as an angel, we may be induced to believe, if we consider the appearances and speeches of angels, who in some texts had said, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac,"' &c. Cyprian (A. D. 250) observes that the 'angel who appeared to the patriarch is Christ and God.' Hilary (A. D. 360) says, 'He who is called the Angel of God, the same is Lord and God. For the Son of God, according to the prophet, "is the angel of the great council!" That the

distinction of persons might be entire, he is called "the Angel of God;" for he who is God of God, the same also is the Angel (or Messenger) of God; and yet at the same time, that due honour might be paid, he is also called "Lord and God."' St Basil (A. D. 370) asks, 'Who, then, is it that is called both an Angel and God? Is it not he whose name we are told is "the Angel of the great covenant?" For though it was in after times that he became the angel of the great covenant, yet even before that he did not disdain the title of an angel or messenger.' He also says, 'It is manifest to every one that, where the same person is styled both an angel and God, it must be meant of the Only-begotten, who manifests himself to mankind in different generations, and declares the will of the Father to his saints. Wherefore he who, at his appearing to Moses, called himself "I AM," cannot be conceived to be any other person than God, the Word who was in the beginning with God.'

Such were the sentiments of the Fathers in the second, third, and fourth centuries; and to these many similar quotations might be added. The most eminent men among modern writers give the same views. The Jewish Targums or Chaldee Paraphrases apply to the *Memra*, or the DIVINE WORD, in numerous passages where Jehovah is spoken of. Although these testimonies and the preceding quotations are from the writings of uninspired men, and therefore are not entitled to implicit credence, yet they are entitled to our respect as the deductions of men distinguished for learning and piety; and we doubt not but a candid inquiry will show that they are so far correct that *many* of the manifestations of Deity recorded in the Old Testament are to be referred to the Saviour of men. This truth is sustained by the following reasoning:—

(*a.*) It has already been shown that Christ is called Jehovah in numerous parts of Scripture; that many passages referring to the works, the declarations, and the prerogatives of the glorious Being called Jehovah in the Old Testament are applied to Jesus Christ in the New Testament. See pages 94—99 of this work. Now, the application of such passages to the Saviour not only shows that the name Jehovah is proper to him as expressive of his Godhead, but, in numerous instances, identifies the very *person* of Christ with Jehovah, who appeared and spake to the prophets in ancient times.

(*b.*) The Lord Jesus is called מלאך הברית, that is, the *Angel or Messenger of the* Covenant, Mal. iii. 1; and this name '*Angel*' is often given to the glorious Being who appeared to the Old Testament saints; and yet this *Angel* or *Messenger* is called God, Jehovah, and both speaks and acts as the God of Israel. Now, the word (מלאך) Melak in Hebrew, and the word (ἄγγελος) Angelos in Greek, is a name not of *nature* but of *office*, and is frequently rendered *messenger;* it is thus applicable to angels, who are God's messengers and ministers, and to good men, such as prophets and apostles, who are commissioned and sent to reveal and proclaim his will; but in its highest sense to Christ, who in the economy of human redemption is SENT of the Father to instruct and save the world. He is emphatically the SHILOH, the *One sent*, the *Angel* or *Messenger* of the covenant. In the Scriptures there are, indeed, many instances recorded of the appearance of celestial beings who are called angels, but there are other instances of the appearance of *One Glorious Being*, called *an Angel*, or *the Angel*, who from the nature of the representation, can be no other than JEHOVAH the Son of God, the promised Saviour of men. We present a few examples.

It was this Angel Jehovah who went before Israel in the wilderness to guide and protect his people; for God thus speaks to his people, 'Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him.'—Exod. xxiii. 20, 21. This, then, is 'the Angel of the covenant,' who claims obedience, whose prerogative it is to pardon or punish, and the name of Jehovah is in him—that is, being God, the name of God is proper to him; for God's name alone is Jehovah, and his glory will he not give to another. This passage is a key to many others where the Angel Jehovah appears to men. The Angel who appeared to Hagar is called God and Jehovah in the same narrative: 'And she called the name of *Jehovah* that spake unto her, Thou God seest me.'—Gen. xvi. 13. Three celestial messengers appeared to Abraham, and one of them is called *Jehovah* not less than eight times: he reveals his purposes to Abraham, and promises him many important blessings: the patriarch worships him, and calls him

the Judge of all the earth.'—Gen. xviii. When Jacob was on his return to his own land, he wrestled with a celestial being until the break of day. This mysterious person would not tell his name to Jacob, but he changed the name of the patriarch from Jacob to Israel, and He blessed him there. It is evident that before this wonderful interview ended Jacob understood him to be God himself, for he said, 'I have seen *God face to face*, and my life is preserved.' Afterwards, when giving his dying benediction to Joseph and his sons, he adverted to this memorable occasion, and the mysterious personage who wrestled with him he speaks of as the *God of his father, and the Angel* who redeemed him from evil—'And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.'—Gen. xxxii. and xlviii. The prophet Hosea, alluding to the same transaction, designates this Angel '*God*,' and '*Jehovah God of Hosts*,' saying, 'He had power with God: yea, he (Jacob) had power over the Angel, and prevailed: he wept, and made supplication unto him: he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us; even Jehovah God of hosts; Jehovah is his memorial.'—Hosea xii. 3—5. No language can more clearly identify the Angel with him who bears the sacred titles of Jehovah and God of Hosts, and no names are employed which more solemnly denote and characterize the Deity. This Angel appeared to Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush, and said, 'I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God.' The whole narrative is full of solemn interest, extending to thirty verses, and in almost every verse the sacred name of Jehovah, or Jehovah God, is applied to this Angel of the Covenant. Numerous other instances might be given, but our space forbids. Now, the term angel is expressive of a *message*, and implies one who is sent; and for this reason it cannot be applied to the Father; but the Son is sent by the Father, and in the work of redemption assumes a subordinate office: therefore, as we have seen, he is called by the prophet Malachi *The Angel of the covenant:* it is thus plain that the Angel Jehovah, who is here represented as appearing to Moses and the patriarchs, is the Son of God.

(*c.*) The name of Christ in the New Testament is sometimes substituted for Jehovah in the Old, and associated with events prior to his incarnation; and this is another proof of his identity with the Jehovah of the Old Testament. For example, the Israelites tempted the Lord in the wilderness by their unbelief, as the Psalmist says, 'They tempted and provoked the Most High God, and kept not his testimonies.'—Ps. lxxviii. 56. But He whom the Psalmist here designates the 'Most High God,' the apostle Paul calls Christ; for, alluding to the same event, he says, 'Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.'—1 Cor. x. 9. Moses, out of love to Jehovah, and a regard for his covenant, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; but this self-denial was practised for Christ, as saith the apostle: 'By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the *reproach of Christ* greater riches than the treasures in Egypt.'—Heb. xi. 24—26.

From the evidence before us, then, it is demonstrated that the appearances of Jehovah, recorded in the Old Testament, were very frequently the appearances of Christ, who was afterwards to become incarnate, and redeem mankind by his death. This is consonant to the office he had undertaken as the Mediator and Saviour of men; for, from the first promise of salvation, the Church was under his care, and the dispensation of grace committed to his hand.

After the overwhelming evidence adduced respecting the Deity of the Saviour, and the answers already furnished to Unitarian objections, there are only a very few other objections which require our attention.

1. Unitarians allege that our Lord acknowledges his subordination to the Father, ascribes his works to his Father's agency, and says that he himself can do nothing; and that, therefore, he cannot be truly and properly God. To these and all kindred objections, however, answers are easily furnished; for

a. It is admitted that Christ, in his mediatorial capacity, assumed an *official* subordination; and it is in accordance with his office to speak of receiving his authority from the Father. In this character he says, 'All (ἐξουσία) authority is given to

me, both in heaven and in earth;' but the reception of this authority implied a pre-existent capacity both to receive and exert it. An ambassador has a subordinate office to a monarch, but not an inferior nature.

b. It is admitted that, as a man, he was actually anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power; but what he derived in his human nature can be no argument against his Divine nature.

c. The union of the persons in the Godhead is so intimate and essential that they do not act independently and irrespectively of each other, but in unison; and the works predicated of the one are often ascribed to the other also. Thus, when Jesus said, 'The Son can do nothing of himself,' he did not mean to assert his own inability, but so close was the union of himself with the Father, that he did not act independently or irrespectively of him. A parallel passage in the same chapter will explain this, where our Lord says, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise;' and again, being accused of the Jews for having performed a miracle on the Sabbath, he said, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.' That is, my Father worketh in providence on the Sabbath, and I work in like manner; 'therefore,' adds the evangelist, 'the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.' From this it is evident that the Jews regarded the term 'Son of God,' in its highest sense, as expressing equality with God. Their inference respecting the Redeemer's claim to equality of nature with God his Father was quite correct—was legitimately drawn from his own words; and as such the Saviour sanctioned it by immediately telling them 'that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.'—John v. 23. At another time the Saviour, speaking of the intimate union of himself with the Father, says to Philip, 'Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me.' It is in the same sense he says, 'I and my Father are one.' For this saying,

also, the Jews took up stones to stone him, because he made himself equal with God.—John v. 17, 18 ; xiv. 10, 11 ; x. 30.

A consideration of these truths will show us how our Lord's acknowledged subordination is compatible with his highest dignity, and how the reference of his works to his Father's power is compatible with his own omnipotent agency. His humanity and mediatorial functions explain the ground of his subordination ; his essential union with the Father explains the reason why the works of the Son are ascribed to the Father, for in the same manner all the works of the Father are ascribed to the Son.

2. Another objection is derived from our Lord's saying, 'My Father is greater than I.'—John xiv. 28. But this passage, when properly considered, and viewed in its connection, speaks nothing in favour of Unitarianism : on the contrary, it supplies an additional argument in support of Christ's Godhead. When our blessed Saviour uttered these words, he could not design to teach that he was a *mere man ;* for what information could he give to his disciples by gravely telling them that God was greater than a man? Nor could he mean to teach them that he was an *angel ;* for what instruction could he give them by solemnly telling them that God was greater than an angel ? Were the disciples so void of common sense as not to know these obvious truths ? and could the holy and loving Redeemer thus trifle with their understandings ? Impossible ! When did Moses or any of the prophets compare themselves with God, and gravely tell the people that God was greater than they were ? The truth is, there is *no comparison*, in point of greatness, betwixt God and any of his creatures ; and the very fact of Christ making a comparison betwixt his own and his Father's greatness is a proof that he was not a creature, but truly and properly God. Indeed, the passage has no reference to the *nature* of Deity at all, with respect to either the Father or the Son. The reference is to the *condition* of Christ, which was then undoubtedly inferior to the *condition* of the Father, because he was in his humble state on earth, as a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. That our Lord was referring to his *condition*, and not to his *nature* as God, is most evident from the context. Let the reader turn to the chapter, and he will find the Saviour is speaking of his being about to leave the world

and go to his Father, and therefore was about to change his *condition;* to leave his state of humiliation and suffering, and enter into his glory. On this account, therefore, he says they ought to rejoice, and not to sorrow. 'Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto my Father: for my Father is greater than I.' The Father was *then* greater in glory, and would be so whilst Christ remained on earth in his humbled state; but that disparity in glory would be removed when our Saviour left the world and entered into his glory. On this account, therefore, they ought to rejoice at his departure, because it would be the period of his exaltation. This period was now at hand; and accordingly we find the Redeemer, immediately after, thus addressing the Father in anticipation of the event, 'I have glorified thee on earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.'—John xvii. 4, 5. The glory which he had with the Father before the creation of the world was his eternal glory—the glory naturally due to him with the Father which he had when in the form of God, before he took upon him the form of man, when, as the apostle says, he thought it no usurpation to be equal with God. But *now*, in his humbled state, the glory of his Father was greater, because his own glory was less than it was before his incarnation—he had laid it aside for a time, and made himself of no reputation. This glory he was now about to resume, and therefore if the disciples loved him, they ought to rejoice in the event. Thus the passage, when viewed consecutively, is fatal to every modification of the Unitarian scheme, and sustains and establishes the arguments already adduced respecting the supreme Divinity and amazing condescension of the Lord of Glory.

3. Against the eternity of Christ, and in proof that he is a created being, there are two passages frequently adduced, and they are the following:—Rev. iii. 14, 'These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the *beginning* of the creation of God;' and Col. i. 15, 'Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature.' It is easy to understand it manifest that these passages neither intend that Christ is a creature, nor that his existence had any beginning.

Let us carefully and candidly examine them. Christ is declared to be the *beginning* of the creation of God. Now, the word which is rendered *beginning* is ἀρχὴ; but if it be contended that this word must mean that Christ had a beginning, and therefore is not eternal, it will prove too much, for it is applied to the Father as well as the Son. In Rev. xxi. 6, the Father says, 'I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning (ἀρχὴ) and the end.' Thus the Unitarian argument would rob the Father of his eternity, as well as the Son, and so it falls to the ground. The meaning of the word ἀρχὴ, *beginning*, is the same here as ἄρχων, *chief, ruler, governor, supreme*—the abstract term being put for the concrete, of which there are many examples. This is evidently its meaning when applied to the Father, and so it is when applied to the Son; and thus, instead of disproving his eternity, it establishes his supremacy and Divinity. In Col. i. 15, Christ is designated 'the *firstborn* of every *creature;*' but neither does this passage favour the Unitarian theory of Christ being a creature, for in the same text he is declared to have existed before all things, and to have 'created all things;' therefore, if the Creator is God, and if God be eternal, the passage is one of the most destructive weapons against Unitarianism, and dashes the system into a thousand pieces. The word πρωτότοκος, *firstborn*, like ἀρχὴ, *beginning*, signifies the Chief, the Supreme, the Lord, the Governor. It is a Hebraism, the translation of the Hebrew word בכור, and must therefore express the same sense. As he who was first-born in a Hebrew family had the pre-eminence and lordship over his brethren, so the word was used to denote pre-eminence or dominion in general. It is applied to kings, Ps. lxxxix. 27. It is applied to death, Job xviii. 13. It is applied to God himself by the Jews, for, as Dr Clarke says, the Jews term Jehovah (בכור כל עולם) 'the first-born of all the world, or of all creation,' to signify his having created or produced all things. The word is thus applied to Christ by St Paul, and his meaning is, 'He is the originator of the universe;' hence he immediately adds, 'for by him were all things created,' &c. This subject might be greatly extended and illustrated by a variety of quotations, but our limits forbid. From what is said it will appear clear that those passages, instead of undermining, establish the Eternity and Deity of our Lord.

4. Another remarkable passage which requires our attention is found in 1 Cor. xv. 24—28, where the apostle says, 'Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.'

In this passage there are two points requiring explanation —namely, Christ's 'delivering up the kingdom,' and his being subject to the Father.' The kingdom referred to is not the universal dominion of our Lord, but the *mediatorial kingdom*, or, in other words, the *dispensation of grace*. It is of this, and of this only, that the apostle is speaking. This kingdom, from its nature and object, must be of temporary duration. It was undertaken for certain purposes, and when those purposes are accomplished it will cease to exist. When our Lord engaged to be our Saviour, the dispensation of grace was committed into his hands. As the Saviour of the world, and Mediator of the new covenant, he was to redeem mankind, bruise the serpent's head, destroy the power of death, and accomplish all things pertaining to his office. The apostle, in the passage before us, is looking forward to this consummation: he is discoursing on the resurrection of the dead, and the events which finish the work of Christ. At this solemn period, the resurrection being effected, and death, the last enemy, destroyed; the proceedings of judgment being closed; devils and impenitent sinners being cast out; the whole Church of God being glorified, the dispensation of grace will end. Then the Lord Jesus will resign his charge, will put off his priestly robes, and lay down the sceptre of his mediatorial government. That is, there being no more souls to save, no more enemies to subdue, no more triumphs to obtain, no more purposes to accomplish, his mediatorial offices will naturally expire. The Jewish economy ceased when, as a typical and introductory dispensation, its objects were answered by the death of Christ; and when the

Christian economy has fulfilled its purpose, it will give place to a still brighter, more perfect, and glorious dispensation.

The phrase, 'Then shall the Son also himself be subject to him that did put all things under him,' refers, we believe, to the *official* act of his resigning the kingdom. It is only another form of expressing the same event. In his receiving that kingdom he assumed a subordinate position, and his resigning it is a recognition of that *official* subordination; and thus the union of purpose, of will, of affection, and glory between the persons of the Godhead is manifested and proclaimed before all angels and happy spirits. That this subjection implies merely a putting off of his official character is evident from the fact, that the attributes and perfections of Divinity, which are essential, are everywhere ascribed to him in the Word of God, as we have already proved; and also from the fact that the same glory and homage are ascribed to him after the termination of the mediatorial kingdom as during its continuance. At present, while our Lord sustains his mediatorial office, the whole host of heaven are described as worshipping him, saying, 'Blessing and honour and glory be unto the Lamb FOR EVER;' and, after his laying aside that office—when the transactions of the day of judgment are passed, and the whole Church of God are congregated in the New Jerusalem—the Lamb is still prophetically described as the light of heaven, and the glory of the eternal city. Thus it is evident that, in his Divine nature, he must for ever exist in indissoluble union with the Father and the Holy Spirit, governing all worlds, and receiving the homage of angels and men.

The phrase, 'that God may be all in all,' implies, as we conceive, that the glory of the Triune God shall be yet more fully and perfectly revealed, after the close of the mediatorial kingdom. In the twenty-fourth verse the apostle speaks of God, *even the Father*, thus distinguishing him from the Son and Spirit, as the person to whom the kingdom is to be delivered; but here, in the twenty-ninth verse, he makes no such distinction. This phrase, therefore, admits the whole Trinity, and seems to designate a new era, and a new dispensation, when, without mediation or intercession, we shall have more direct and immediate intercourse with God, and brighter discoveries of his glory.

5. Against the Saviour's Godhead it has been alleged that he prayed to the Father; but this objection is totally irrelevant. Had we denied his real humanity, it might with propriety have been adduced; but as the actions proper to God are no disproof of his manhood, so the actions of his humanity are no disproof of his Godhead. Christ did more than pray; he suffered and died; and prayer is not more incongruous with his nature than suffering and dying. All these, indeed, were essential to make him a perfect Saviour: prayer, to render him a perfect example; and sufferings and death, to render him an atoning sacrifice; while his Divinity gave infinite dignity, perfection, and efficacy to his obedience and death on our behalf. It is worthy of remark, too, that the worship which Christ rendered to the Father was distinct from that of all human creatures. He never confesses sin; never prays for pardon; never asks for grace to sanctify his nature and make him holy. It must also be remembered that his worship was merely temporary—limited to the period of his sojourn on earth, during which time he was our example. If our Lord were a mere creature, his worship of God would be a duty during the whole period of his existence, in eternity as well as time: indeed, the highest and most perfect adoration must, in that case, be rendered by him in the heavenly state. But we never find Christ engaged in worship there. Neither before his incarnation nor after his ascension do we find him engaged in a single act of worship, though angels and men fill the regions of heaven with their eternal anthems. The worship rendered by Christ is confined exclusively to the period of his earthly sojourn. In heaven, angels and men worship him, but he worships not. Instead of *rendering* worship there to the Father, he *receives* it with the Father from all orders of intelligent beings—the same eternal anthems being presented to God and the Lamb. If, then, his prayers, tears, and sufferings declare the reality of his humanity, his being an object of eternal adoration with the Father, proclaims his Deity.

Is it demanded that if, indeed, the Saviour be God, why did he not more fully and explicitly declare this truth? Why did he not constantly proclaim it to the world, and render it so evident and clear that no doubt could remain? If this inquiry arise from a captious and unbelieving spirit, it may be demanded, in return, 'Who art thou, O man, that callest thy

Maker to account for his conduct? Why dost thou strive against him? for to the proud and unsubdued caviller he giveth not account of any of his matters.' But to the humble and candid inquirer an answer may be given, and to such we reply—

1. That such an overwhelming discovery of the Redeemer's Deity would not have been compatible with the free agency of man, nor with that spirit of faith and obedience which the Gospel requires, and which is necessary for the moral training of rational beings. The works of creation do not exhibit such a manifestation of God's existence as is irresistible: though the evidence is clear to the perception of a mind in love with the truth, it is rejected by the arrogant unbeliever—by the fool —who 'saith in his heart, There is no God.'

2. The Redeemer did repeatedly assert his supreme dignity; but the constant proclamation and exhibition of that dignity, by his *personal* ministry, would not have been consistent with that state of humiliation and abasement to which he had condescended for our salvation. He came into our world not to publish his own glory, but to reveal the Divine will; to encounter and rebuke the spirit of selfishness and pride, by stooping to the lowest condition of our race; to present an example of perfect obedience; and, finally, to die for our sins. It was, therefore, necessary that his dignity should be concealed by an humble demeanour, and his glory obscured by the veil of his humanity. Had he given every possible demonstration of his Deity, it is evident such a proceeding would have rendered his person unapproachable, his sufferings and death impossible, his condition devoid of connection or sympathy with the wretchedness of man, and his example incapable of embodying those virtues which miserable man is most required to cultivate. It would have been defective in that tenderness and loveliness—that attractive and persuasive interest—which we see thrown around it; in a word, the design of his coming upon earth would have been frustrated. The blessed Saviour adopted that state at once the most expressive of his tenderness and love, and best adapted to answer the purposes of his mission. As the prophet had foretold, he did not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets, seeking the praise and honour of men. When the populace would make him king, he

evaded their design; when he wrought astonishing miracles, he often imposed silence upon the tongue of gratitude. Respecting his Messiahship, he frequently maintained reserve; and when he revealed some glorious truth respecting his dignity, he charged his disciples not to make it known, because the time for his being glorified had not then arrived. In the inculcation of preceptive truth and duty—in the development of great practical principles, neglected and forgotten by man—he was proverbially plain. In reproving sin he was keen, searching, and authoritative. In consoling the penitent, inimitably tender; and, indeed, in respect to the revelation of doctrine, the germs of every Gospel truth are embodied in his discourses. But in the discovery of his *own* greatness there was a dignified reserve; teaching it more by implication than by assertion; by the application of prophecy, than by personal avowal; and by his works, than by his words: still reserving the full manifestation of his glory until his work was done, until he had risen from the dead, ascended on high, and poured out the Holy Spirit upon the ambassadors of his grace. As on a cloudy day we have light, though the sun be concealed, so the ministry of Christ poured a flood of light upon our dark world, although the brightness of his own majesty was not seen. The Sun of Righteousness had arisen, and his beams diffused a healing virtue, though their splendour was bedimmed by the veil of his humanity. As he gifted Richard Watson has observed, 'The cloud which enveloped him during his humble state on earth was dark, but it was the cloud of Shekinah; it was the Lord who dwelt in the thick darkness; and although the Divinity occasionally beamed forth, yet, like light from a parted cloud, it was quickly shrouded again in the veil of his humble condition and demeanour.' But, after that veil had been rent by the agonies of death, the glory stood revealed, and it became manifest that he who occupied the mercy-seat, in the holy place not made with hands, was he whom Esaias of old had beheld filling the temple with his glory; and henceforth the apostles, no longer wondering what manner of person this is,' unite with prophets in recognizing him as the Holy Lord God Almighty, whose presence and glory fill the earth and the heavens.

What, then, is the evidence adduced from the Scriptures in proof of our Lord's supreme Divinity? We have shown that

all *the names and titles of Deity* are ascribed to him; that he is called God, the true God, the great God, the mighty God, our God, Jehovah, Jehovah God of Hosts, King of kings and Lord of lords. If these titles, then, prove the Deity of the Father, they in the same manner prove the Deity of the Son. We have shown also that the *attributes of Deity*—eternity, immutability, omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence—are ascribed to him: if, then, these perfections prove the Deity of the Father, they establish also the Deity of the Son. We have further shown that the *works and prerogatives of Deity*—the creation and preservation of the universe; the pardoning of sin; the raising of the dead, and judging of the world at the last day; the reception of the highest confidence and love; the highest homage and adoration from angels and men—are ascribed to him; that he is Lord of the Temple and of the Sabbath, and that both were consecrated to his honour and worship. If, therefore, these prerogatives prove the Deity of the Father, they must necessarily establish the Deity of the Son. To reject these evidences is to reject every proof by which the existence of God can be established; it is to exclude Deity from the universe; it is, *logically*, to become the abettors of Atheism.

In reference, then, to the blessed Saviour, our second proposition is established. Our next chapter must be devoted to the Scriptural proofs which establish the personality and Godhead of the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER V.

THE PERSONALITY AND DEITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The Personality and Godhead of the Holy Spirit are clearly taught in the sacred Scriptures, and it now devolves upon us to establish these important doctrines. The rationalizing theory which resists the bright and overpowering evidence of the Holy Scriptures in reference to the Deity of Christ, rejects that also respecting the Holy Spirit, denying both his Deity and his personality. Unitarians usually attempt to get rid of the personality of the Holy Spirit by resolving him into an *attribute*,

or into a *periphrasis* for the Father himself. Thus, if assertion could pass for argument, a stroke of the pen would efface an important doctrine from the sacred records; but we have not so learned Christ. That the Holy Spirit is not an attribute, an influence, or a periphrasis for the Father, has already been rendered evident in pages 71, 72; but the subject is far from being exhausted, and further evidences of the Holy Spirit's personality seem to be an appropriate introduction to the proofs of his Deity.

The theory which would resolve the Holy Spirit into an attribute is chargeable with absurdity so manifestly gross as not to bear a moment's examination. For example: let the Holy Spirit be considered the power of God in the following passages. In Acts x. 38, it is said that 'God anointed Jesus with the Holy Ghost and with power.' That is, on the Unitarian principle of interpretation, *God anointed Jesus with holy power and with power.* Rom. xv. 13, 'Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost.' That is, *through the power of the holy power.* Verse 19, 'Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God.' That is, *through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the power of God.* In 1 Cor. ii. 4, Paul says, 'And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.' That is, *in demonstration of the power and of power.* These instances may suffice to show the egregious folly, not to say impiety, of the sentiment which forces a construction so unnatural and preposterous upon the teachings of inspiration.

All the attributes of a person, and the modes of acting peculiar to a conscious intelligent being, are ascribed to the Blessed Spirit. It is true, indeed, that in a figurative and poetical style of speaking, a mere attribute may be invested with personality; but poetry is the language of passion, emotion, and imagination, and the licences peculiar to it cannot be applied to simple narrative, to plain, didactic statement and calm discourse. For example: the Holy Ghost is said to have been blasphemed by the Pharisees, who ascribed our Lord's miracles to Satanic agency; and Ananias and Sapphira are said to have lied unto the Holy Ghost.' In these cases we have narrative

and statement too simple, and under circumstances too solemn, to admit for a moment the supposition of tropes and poetic figures being employed. But if there can be sin against the Holy Ghost, as it is here plainly asserted, it necessarily follows that the Holy Ghost is a *person;* for, as Dr Dwight observes, a lie is a wilful deception, and can be told only to an intelligent being, because such a being only can perceive the meaning of the declaration with which the liar intends to deceive; or in other words, because only such can receive the lie at his mouth. A child perfectly knows that he cannot lie to a tree or a stone, because they are unconscious of what he says. But an *attribute* is as unconscious as a tree or a stone, or any inanimate object in creation; and although God perceives all things, yet his *power* perceives nothing. A lie, therefore, cannot, in the physical sense of possibility, be told to the power of God. And these remarks, in reference to lying, apply with equal force to blasphemy or any other sin which men commit.

The rite of baptism, as connected with the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, has already been considered, showing that as this holy ordinance is commanded to be performed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the association of the Spirit with the Father and the Son is as clear a proof of his personality as can be desired—certainly as clear a proof of the Spirit's personality as it is of the personality of the Father and the Son. The same evidence appears in the apostolic benediction—'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.' If the Saviour who bestows '*grace*' is a *person*, and the Father who imparts his '*love*' to our hearts is a *person*, it is equally certain that the Holy Spirit who grants his '*communion*' and '*fellowship*' to the saints is a *person* also; but the Unitarian notion implies that we are to hold communion with an *attribute* —a thing both absurd and impossible.

The actions and modes of operating ascribed to the Holy Spirit are set forth with great frequency and variety in the sacred writings, and they are such as clearly characterize an intelligent being. He is represented as speaking. 'He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak.'—John xvi. 13. 'Then the Spirit said to Peter, Behold, three men seek thee,' &c. 'The Spirit said to Philip.'

—Acts x. 19; viii. 29. 'He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.' 'The Spirit and the bride say, Come.'—Rev. ii. 7; xxii. 17. The Spirit is said to be *pleased:* 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us,' Acts xv. 28. To be *vexed:* 'They rebelled, and vexed his Holy Spirit,' Isa. lxiii. 10. To be *grieved:* 'And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption,' Eph. iv. 30. He is set forth as 'knowing,' 'willing,' 'moving,' 'striving,' 'helping,' 'interceding,' 'leading,' 'guiding,' 'comforting.' He is said to take of the things of Christ, and show them unto us; to foretell things to come; to bear witness with God's people, as to their adoption; to dwell in their hearts as his temple, filling them with the light and joy of his presence. If language can express personality —if actions and modes of personal operation can indicate a conscious, intelligent being—we have them undoubtedly presented here in almost every variety of form; and the attempt to resolve such varied representations into mere figures of speech is equally unworthy of the scholar and the Christian. It can only be regarded as a licentious and reckless endeavour to sustain a system at the expense of all candour, and all just regard to the credit and authority of the sacred volume.

A few cases there are in Scripture in which the word *spirit* may be regarded as employed figuratively. In such instances it accords with the usage of our own language: for example, when we speak of the *spirit* of the age, or the *spirit* of the times, we mean the distinguishing temper or genius of the age, or the times; so, in Scripture language, we read of the *spirit* of the world, as when the apostle says, 'We have not received the spirit of the world.' Such cases, corresponding exactly with our own tongue, are clearly understood. But it is a fact never to be lost sight of, that the word SPIRIT, when qualified by the adjective HOLY, is not in any single instance thus employed in a figurative sense. Nor is the phrase, '*Spirit of God*,' or '*Spirit of Christ*,' ever employed figuratively. We have searched the whole volume of the sacred records, and can confidently assert, what is of high importance in our argument, that in *every* instance where the word 'HOLY SPIRIT,' or 'HOLY GHOST,' or 'SPIRIT OF GOD,' or 'SPIRIT OF CHRIST' is found, a real, personal meaning is intended.

While the Scriptures are thus clear and decisive in their testimony to the personality of the Holy Spirit, they are equally clear and decisive respecting his Godhead. The same line of argument may be adopted on this subject as that we have already pursued in reference to the Saviour's Deity. The names, the attributes, the works, and prerogatives of Deity which are ascribed to the Father and Son, are ascribed also to the Holy Spirit; and these undoubtedly establish his claim to the same Divinity and glory.

1. THE NAMES OF DEITY ARE APPLIED TO THE HOLY GHOST. He is called 'God,' 'Lord,' 'Jehovah,' 'Jehovah God,' 'the God of Israel,' 'Jehovah God of Hosts,' &c. When Ananias was detected in his hypocrisy, Peter said, 'Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.' And in addressing Sapphira he also said, 'How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?' Here, while the name of God is emphatically applied to the Holy Spirit, the circumstances show that it was used in no inferior or subordinate sense, but plainly as expressing supreme Divinity. It was GOD who searcheth the heart, and from whom no secret thing can be hid, who at the same time convicted the guilty pair in their own bosom, and revealed their guilt to his minister, the Apostle Peter. It was GOD whose laws were trampled under foot, whose holy dictates were resisted, and whose Divine majesty was insulted by the sin committed. Therefore it is said, 'Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God;' and this Divine person is called the Holy Ghost.

A multitude of passages might be adduced in which the names 'Holy Ghost' and 'God' are employed interchangeably; and the same actions ascribed to God in one part of Scripture are ascribed to the Holy Ghost in another. In Acts i. 16, 20, St Peter, speaking of the apostasy of Judas as a fulfilment of prophecy, says, 'Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas . . . . For it is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: and his bishopric let another take.' This prediction is taken from Psalms lxix. and cix., and the glorious Being with whom the Psalmist is there

described as having religious intercourse is designated 'God,' 'Jehovah,' 'the God of Israel,' 'Jehovah God,' 'Jehovah God of Hosts;' and while David speaks by the Holy Ghost, receiving Divine communications *from* him, qualifying him to foretell future events, he renders *unto* him prayer, thanksgiving, adoration, praise, and every form of religious homage; and, as if his own efforts were insufficient to set forth his glory, he calls upon 'the heavens, the earth, the sea,' and universal Nature, to unite in lauding his glorious name. The Apostle Peter, referring to the inspiration of the Scriptures, declares that 'the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' Thus the sacred writers were penmen of the Holy Ghost; what he dictated they recorded. They were the instruments, but he is the Author; and the Apostle Paul, teaching the same truth, expressly calls this author '*God*,' saying, 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of GOD, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof,' &c. It is not necessary to exclude the presence and agency of either the Father or the Son in these and similar instances; it is sufficient if it be admitted that, in some sense, the agency of the Holy Spirit was *more peculiarly* exerted in inspiration. This fact, which the Scriptures everywhere teach, identifies the special presence and operation of the Spirit in such passages, and the application to him of the names appropriate only to Deity establishes his Godhead beyond doubt.

We may select a few more instances. In 2 Cor. iii. 17, the Holy Spirit is called 'Lord.' In the third verse the apostle, speaking of the vital energy which the Holy Ghost inspires in the hearts of true believers, quickening, purifying, and sanctifying their nature, and rendering their lives illustrious examples of the truth and power of Christianity, says, 'Ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the *Spirit* of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.' In the 17th verse, speaking of the *same Spirit*, he says, 'Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' Thus the Spirit is not an attribute or an influence, but emphatically 'The Lord.' In Judges xv. 14, it is said of Samson that 'the *Spirit* of Jehovah came mightily upon him,'

and this was the cause of his miraculous strength; but when he had broken his covenant with God, it is said 'that Jehovah had departed from him,' and he became weak as other men. Thus the *Spirit* in one passage, and *Jehovah* in another, designate the same glorious Being, whose coming gave Samson supernatural strength; whose departure, when grieved and insulted, left him the weak and helpless victim of his enemies. In Isa. vi. the prophet beheld a representation of Jehovah of Hosts in his holy temple, and received from his lips a prophecy of the stubborn unbelief and impenitence of the Jewish people; and when this prediction was fulfilled, St Paul ascribes the prophecy to the Holy Spirit, saying, 'Well spake the HOLY GHOST by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers,' &c., Acts xxviii. 25—27. Thus the apostle identifies the Holy Spirit with Jehovah of Hosts. In Luke i. 67, &c., it is said that Zacharias, the father of John, was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying, 'Blessed be THE LORD GOD OF ISRAEL; for HE hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; as HE spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began.' Now, seeing that the Apostle Peter declares that the prophets 'spake as they were moved by the *Holy Ghost*,' and seeing Zacharias, under the same infallible guidance, designates him 'the *Lord God of Israel*,' *who spoke by the mouth of the holy prophets*, it follows that this Divine title is applicable to him, and proclaims his Godhead. The connection and harmony manifested in the collocation of the passages before us are strikingly apparent: for, as inspiration is exclusively the work of God, the passages which invest the Spirit, its Author, with the names of God are in unison with that fact, and thus the one truth confirms and establishes the other; and both combine to command our unqualified assent to the Scriptures, and fill us with holy reverence for their glorious Author.

2. THE ATTRIBUTES AND PERFECTIONS OF DEITY ARE ASCRIBED TO THE HOLY SPIRIT. *He is eternal.* 'Christ who, through the *eternal* Spirit, once offered himself to God.' Here the threefold distinction of persons is recognized. '*God*,' '*Christ*,' and the '*Spirit*,' who is declared to be *eternal*. *Omnipotent energy* is ascribed to the Holy Spirit in a multitude of

passages, which we shall hereafter adduce. *Omnipresence* is also ascribed to him. 'Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.' These declarations have respect to God and the 'Holy Spirit,' and if they assert the omnipresence of the one, they assert the omnipresence of the other also. The Holy Spirit is declared *omniscient*. Many passages show that the Holy Ghost reads the hearts of men, but the following affords a more striking proof of omniscience, by showing that the Spirit knows all the mind of Deity: 'For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.'—1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. Here is an illustration of omniscience the most forcible that can be adduced, and, as it appeals to our own consciousness, it is one which we can best understand. Even as the mind of man is conscious of its own thoughts and emotions, however deeply they may be concealed from others, so the Holy Spirit penetrates into all the profound counsels, and comprehends all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge contained in the infinite ocean of the eternal mind. All the thoughts, volitions, purposes, and affections of the infinite Godhead are known by the Spirit, intuitively and immediately, just as a man is conscious of his own thoughts, sentiments, and emotions. No language, or mode of expression, can furnish a more explicit declaration of omniscience. More ample illustration of these attributes will be given when we come to dwell upon the operations of the Spirit. Meanwhile, it may be remembered that, as these perfections can belong to none but Deity, the application of them in these passages to the Holy Spirit supplies an incontrovertible proof of his Godhead.

The *moral* perfections of God are also ascribed to the blessed Spirit. *He is true.* The Saviour calls him the Spirit of truth; and St John says, 'It is the *Spirit* that beareth witness, because the *Spirit is truth.*'—1 John v. 6. *He is good, or benevolent.* Nehemiah, speaking of God's mercy to ancient

Israel, says, 'Thou gavest also thy *good Spirit* to instruct them,' ix. 20; and the Psalmist prays, 'Teach me to do thy will; for thou art my God: thy Spirit is *good;* lead me into the land of uprightness.'—Ps. cxliii. 10. *He is holy.* He is called 'the *Holy One,*' 1 John ii. 20; and the '*Holy Spirit*' is his ordinary designation. He is absolutely and eternally holy; and this attribute comprehends every other moral perfection. These are qualities which essentially and absolutely apply to no being but God himself.

3. The works and prerogatives of Deity are ascribed to the Holy Spirit. We have seen the works of creation ascribed to the Father and the Son, and the same authority ascribes them to the Holy Spirit. After the fiat which brought matter into being, the first agency we find employed in the construction of the universe is that of the Holy Spirit. Ere the heavens and the earth had received their form—when the chaotic mass was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, the Spirit of God (מרחפת) *was moving* or brooding over the inert and confused mass, penetrating it with his omnipotent and vivifying energy, impregnating the congeries with their appropriate qualities, affinities, and laws; arranging and disposing the whole according to his unerring wisdom and sovereign pleasure. In each successive act of creating energy the blessed Spirit participated, for, says Job, 'by his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens'—xxvi. 13; and Elihu says, 'The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.' Thus, if the glorious work of creation be challenged as a proof of the existence and Deity of the Father and the Son, it is equally a proof of the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

The wonderful economy of Providence implies the same omnipotent agency and all-pervading presence as the work of creation. It is, indeed, a continued creation—a perpetual renovation and reproduction. The pious Psalmist acknowledges this fact, and ascribes the work to the Holy Spirit. Speaking of the absolute dependence of all creatures upon God, he says, 'Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth.'—Ps. civ. 29, 30. Thus each reviving spring,

and each successive generation of men and inferior animals, like a new creation, is declaratory of the Spirit's presence and omnipotent energy.

In the economy of grace the Holy Spirit performs a benign and conspicuous part. He begins, carries forward, and completes the work of salvation in the hearts of his people. It is impossible to estimate the immense amount of moral and spiritual good resulting from his holy influence upon the human heart. He is the great source of light and grace to the world —the fountain of holiness, love, and joy; and, excepting the gift of Christ, the bestowment of his agency is the greatest and most important blessing ever conferred upon our fallen world.

He is sent 'to convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.' Without his holy influence men would live totally regardless of God, and reckless of consequences. They would 'walk according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind.' Sin would always be their element, rebellion the unbroken habit of their existence, and their alienation from God unalterable and eternal. The Holy Spirit breaks their carnal repose, enlightens the understanding, quickens the conscience, and arouses their fears. 'He strives with men,' debates and contends the matter with them, urges the claims of God, the truths and duties of religion, and the solemn interests of the eternal state. He invites and entreats the rebel to lay down the weapons of his hostility, to touch the sceptre of mercy, and return to his allegiance to God: and, though resisted, grieved, and insulted by ungrateful man, still perseveres with loving importunity, crying, 'Why will ye die?' and never departs until man becomes incorrigible, and the measure of his iniquity is full.

The great work of regeneration is ascribed to the Holy Spirit. 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' Believers are saved, 'not by works of righteousness which they have done, but by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.' The agency exerted by the Holy Ghost in this moral renovation is set forth by the Apostle as a display of '*the exceeding greatness of his power.*' If transforming the chaotic mass of matter into beauty,

order, and harmony was a great work, so is the work of renewing the depraved, rebellious nature of man, and transforming it into the beauty, order, and loveliness of the Divine image. If the one exhibits a display of physical energy which none but God could exert, the other presents a manifestation of moral energy which the Deity alone could put forth. As this is the appropriate work of God, to God it is ascribed; for believers are 'born not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, *but of God.*' 'Every one that loveth *is born of God.*' In these passages, and in several others, the phrase '*born of the Spirit,*' and the phrase '*born of God,*' are thus convertible terms—the same words, the same prepositions, governing the same case, are, in the original, used in both phrases; and the only change is that of the word '*God*' put for the word '*Spirit,*' as will appear obvious to the eye of the general reader, if he will only compare the following words:—John iii. 6, *τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος*, that which is born of the Spirit: 1 John v. 4, *τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, that which is born of God. This fact unites with those already introduced in proclaiming the proper Deity of the Holy Spirit.

He dwells in the hearts of his people. 'What, know ye not that your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost, which is in you?' This furnishes a twofold argument for the Deity of the Holy Spirit—his *omnipresence*, and his right to Divine homage. If he dwells in the hearts of all the saints, he must be everywhere present, and this declares his Godhead. If believers' bodies are called temples, the allusion is to the Jewish sanctuary, dedicated to the worship of the living God. In this sacred enclosure was the Shekinah, the visible symbol of the Divine Being, who dwelt between the cherubim over the mercy-seat, receiving the homage of his worshippers. As the bodies of the saints are temples, the Holy Spirit is the Deity who dwells therein, claiming and receiving the homage of their sanctified affections. The same prerogative is ascribed to the Father and the Son. For, thus saith the Lord Almighty, 'I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.' In like manner the Apostle Paul speaks of Christ being in believers—dwelling in their hearts by faith: 'Christ in you, the hope of glory.' Thus the Triune God lives and reigns in the saints. The Triune God is love,

and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.

The Holy Spirit imparts comfort to the people of God; and, in consequence of his consoling and peace-inspiring influence, is denominated THE COMFORTER. Hence the Saviour's gracious promise: 'And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.' Thrice was this promise repeated to the disconsolate disciples, and the day of Pentecost beheld its fulfilment. Then they were filled with the Holy Ghost—the 'God of all comfort;' then their sorrows and unbelief departed, and they were prepared for labours without weariness, and for dangers without fear. They were filled with comfort in all their tribulations, and were able to comfort them which were in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith they themselves were comforted of God. This, too, is the common privilege of the saints in every age, for 'the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us,' inspiring 'peace which passeth all understanding.' The bestowment of this privilege upon all believers proves again the omnipresence of the Spirit; and, as it is bestowed upon none but believers, it implies a discernment of the heart, which proves also his omniscience. The bestowment of comfort is elsewhere ascribed to both the Father and the Son. 'Now, our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and establish you in every good word and work.' While the application of the name '*Comforter*' to the Holy Ghost shows that the bestowment of this grace is more especially *his* appropriate work, its ascription also to both Father and Son shows both the *combined agency* of the glorious Three, and their essential union in the Godhead.

The Holy Ghost bears witness to the acceptance and adoption of the children of God. One of the highest privileges the saints enjoy is an assurance that they are approved of God, enabling them to exclaim with the Apostle John, 'Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God! therefore the world knoweth us not,

because it knew Him not. Beloved, now are we the sons of God.' But this assurance is not a conclusion elaborated and deduced by a process of reasoning; nor is it given by a voice, a vision, or any external manifestation. It is attested by the Holy Spirit within us, and that testimony is recognized by *consciousness*. Such is the Apostle Paul's doctrine, 'for,' he says, 'ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The SPIRIT ITSELF beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.'—Romans viii. 15, 16. Again, writing to the Galatians, he says, 'And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.'—iv. 6. These statements are too clear and decisive to admit of any sophistical evasion; and while they publish, as with a sunbeam, the privilege of the believer in Christ, they proclaim its author—God. He who is thus present with all believers, in all ages, and in all places, must, as before noticed, have the attribute of *ubiquity;* and he who inspires in their hearts this blessed assurance, must have *all knowledge*. Not only must he perceive with the utmost precision, and intuitive certainty, the state of every heart, through every moment of life, but also comprehend the whole mind of God, and his relationship, whether favourable or adverse, to every rational being, for the *validity* of his testimony rests on this knowledge. Now it is evident that such knowledge can belong to no being except God himself; but the Holy Scriptures ascribe it to the Holy Spirit, and thus proclaim his Godhead: 'For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.'—1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. In this gracious office of the Holy Ghost, we see another manifestation of the unity of the Godhead; as the sinner's justification has the combined testimony of Father, Son, and Spirit. For when the Apostle says, 'It is God that justifieth,' he adds, 'It is Christ that died,'—his blood cleanses the conscience from dead works. At the same time, it is the Spirit that beareth witness, and the Spirit is truth. Thus there are three that bear record, the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Spirit*, and these Three are One; and 'he that believeth hath the witness in himself.'—1 John v.

10. From the evidence before us, the solemn truth follows that no man *can* believe in the Spirit's witness who denies his Deity; and if he believe not, how can he receive? Thus, a right faith is essential to a right experience; and unbelief excludes men from the blessings of salvation, by closing the heart itself against their reception. He who prescribed to man the conditions of salvation, and made faith one essential condition, has acted, not on his sovereign pleasure alone, but on his perfect knowledge of the principles and constitution of the human mind. There is a natural as well as a moral reason why it is declared, 'He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.'

The Holy Ghost sanctifies the true believer in Christ. St Peter, addressing believers, speaks of them as 'elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through *sanctification of the Spirit*, unto obedience.' St Paul, writing to the Thessalonians, says, 'But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through *sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth*.' And when addressing the Corinthian believers and adverting to the happy contrast which had been accomplished by Divine grace, he says, 'And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the *Spirit of our God*.'—1 Cor. vi. 11. The entire sanctification of our nature consists in the eradication of all evil, and the restoration of our souls completely to the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness. It is the putting of our souls into a state of moral rectitude, and the conforming of our habits to the requirements of God's will. It is to be made perfect in love—to love God with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our mind, and with all our strength; and our neighbour as ourselves. This glorious transformation of our nature is the appropriate work of the Holy Ghost. 'We are changed into the same image from glory to glory, by the Spirit of the Lord.' Yet while it is more especially his work, the Father and the Son so far participate or act in concert therein, that the work is sometimes ascribed to them also. St Paul, speaking of the union betwixt Christ and his people, says, 'For both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all one: for which cause

he is not ashamed to call them brethren;' and St Jude addresses his epistle 'to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Christ Jesus.' In some passages the work is ascribed to its Divine Author, without any formal recognition of distinct personality, but still it is set forth as the work of none but God, as in the following text: 'And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray *God* your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.'—1 Thess. v. 23. We are inclined to believe that 'the *God of peace*' is designed for the Holy Ghost, 'the Comforter,' the giver of 'the peace which passeth all understanding;' but whichever person is referred to, or whether or not any distinction be designed, the work itself is recognized as the work of the Deity—'the God of peace,' and such indeed its nature absolutely implies.

As the Spirit sanctifies, so all the holy dispositions and graces which constitute and adorn the Christian character are described as fruits of the *Spirit*. For 'the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.'—Gal. v. 22, 23. Yet, in the production of these heavenly fruits, the agency of both Father and Son is also recognized; for, says our blessed Lord, 'I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit.' —John xv.

The Holy Ghost affords gracious assistance in prayer. This duty is the most sacred and important devolving upon man. It is the intercourse of the soul with God, uttering its penitent emotions in the confession of sin, its earnest desires in imploring mercy and pleading for blessings, and presenting the tribute of its gratitude in thanksgiving and praise. The right performance of such a duty must depend, not upon the construction of words, but upon the state of the affections and

lispositions, for God is a Spirit, and they that worship him nust worship him in spirit and in truth. Hence believers are et forth 'as praying in the Holy Ghost'—breathing their etitions to the throne of grace under his blessed influence and gency. The aid of the Spirit in prayer is thus distinctly recognized, and the nature of his assistance is minutely set forth y St Paul: 'Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: or we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but he Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh ntercession for the saints according to the will of God.'—Rom. viii. 26, 27. The Holy Ghost helps the infirmity of our gnorance. 'He teaches us what we shall say unto him; for ve cannot order our speech by reason of darkness.' Our knowedge is so imperfect that we neither understand our own ecessities nor the importance of spiritual blessings, and, if eft to ourselves, should foolishly ask for those things that are urtful, and neglect those which are necessary. But the Holy Ghost helpeth the infirmity of our ignorance by revealing to s our true character and condition. He helps the infirmity of ur unbelief, by 'taking of the things of Christ and showing em unto us.' He assists our meditations on the Saviour; nfolds the Saviour's character and work, his ability, his efficacy, s mercy. He directs us to the promises, reveals and expands em to our view in all their freshness, their fulness, and laptation. He also makes intercession for us,—not by pleadg for us at the right hand of God, for that is the appropriate ork of our great High Priest, who appears in the presence of od for us, but by pleading *within us*,—by enkindling our deres, exciting our affections, and arousing the soul into a state wrestling earnestness and pleading importunity, producing notions too intense for language to utter, such as can only expressed in sighs, and groans, and tears. These holy oans are the true eloquence of prayer, they are the language the Spirit of God; and, though no articulations be employed, e that searcheth the heart knoweth what is the mind of his n Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints ording to God.*

* See the author's work on 'The Three Intercessions.'

The exercise of this gracious office clearly implies the Deity of the Holy Spirit; for it involves the power of being present in all places, and of possessing knowledge which has no bounds—a knowledge of every thought of the human heart, and a consciousness of all the mind of God; and such attributes we have already seen are expressly ascribed to him. It should be observed, too, that the whole exercise of prayer affords to our own minds a vivid manifestation of the Trinity in *Unity*—the Three Glorious Persons are combined in aiding and blessing the praying soul. While the Son intercedes as our High Priest, the Spirit helps our infirmities, and the Father recognizes infinite reasons in both why he should dispense the richest blessings to his prayerful and believing people.

The Holy Ghost leads and guides his people into all saving truth. The Saviour promised this to his disciples: 'Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth.' This was fulfilled in its highest sense when the Holy Ghost was given to inspire the disciples, and qualify them to complete the revelations of the Christian dispensation. But a guidance is here promised, which applies to all the saints as their common privilege: 'For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God;' and St John, addressing believers in general, says, 'Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.'—1 John ii. 20.

The instruction or guidance which is here promised relates to the Divine will, and it is given inwardly and immediately by the Spirit's *direct* impression upon the heart. This is such as God alone can impart. Man, or the written word, may do it *instrumentally* and *externally;* but it is the work of the Spirit to impart it *directly* and *internally*. Had the saint to rely upon the instructions of any fallible agent, he might well hesitate and falter in his confidence, and however implicitly he might rely upon his guide, would constantly be liable to go astray. But he who guides us is God, and to God this office is continually assigned. Hence the Psalmist devoutly prays, 'Teach me to do thy will; for thou art my God: thy Spirit is good; lead me into the land of uprightness.'—Ps. cxliii. 10. 'Thus saith Jehovah, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; I am Jehovah thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldest go.'—Isa. xlviii. 17.

We have thus given examples of the principal offices and operations of the Holy Ghost in reference to our *personal* and *individual* salvation. Looking at their nature, may we not ask—Can evidence more satisfactory be desired in reference to his personal existence, and his supreme dignity and glory? and looking at their importance, are we not bound to cherish the most ardent gratitude to God for their bestowment? Well might the penitent Psalmist deprecate the departure of the Spirit as the greatest evil he could suffer, and cry out, as if in agony, 'Take not thy *Holy Spirit* from me.' Well might blasphemy against the Spirit be pronounced a sin which involves the deepest ingratitude and malignity of heart; and when the cup of man's iniquity was filling to the brim, well might the awful admonition be heard, 'My Spirit shall not always strive with man.' That sentence was a gleam of the coming vengeance, a startling flash from the dark thunder-cloud of wrath, the terrific prelude to a world's destruction.

There are many other offices of the Holy Ghost employed for the interests of the Church of God in general, and they all combine to show forth his glorious Deity.

He inspired prophets and apostles to reveal his truth. In reference to the inspiration of the writers of the Old Testament, numerous passages have already been adduced in pages 53—57, and to these we again refer the reader. The same inspiration by the Holy Ghost was expressly promised to the apostles: 'These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.'—John xiv. 25, 26; xvi. 12—14. This gracious promise relates principally to qualifications for three things—the recording of the teachings of Christ which we have in the four Gospels—the expansion and development of these teachings by *new* revelations—and the prediction of

future events. All these we have in the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles, and the Book of Revelation. The fact that this promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, authenticates the writings of the New Testament as the production of the Holy Ghost, and this gives them equal authority with the writings of the Old Testament: so that, in the most comprehensive sense, it may be affirmed, that 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,' and the Church is 'built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.' The Holy Ghost, then, being the Author of the Holy Scriptures, furnishes another proof of his Deity, for the sacred volume contains such a revelation of religious truths as none but an omniscient Being could discover, and a record of such prophecies as none but the prescience of Jehovah could make known.

The bestowment of miraculous gifts is ascribed to the Holy Ghost. When the disciples, on the day of Pentecost, were filled with the Holy Ghost, they began to speak with other tongues as the SPIRIT gave them utterance, and mighty signs and wonders were wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost. When men were filled with amazement at what they saw and heard, the apostles ascribed their power to the Holy Ghost, saying, 'This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy: and I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath.'—Acts ii. 16—19. These extraordinary gifts were not confined to the apostles, but, as it appears, were bestowed upon believers generally in the first period of the Church: 'To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues: but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.'—1 Cor. xii. 7—11.

Yet, as again indicating the essential unity of the Godhead, while these miraculous operations are ascribed specially to the Holy Ghost, to denote his peculiar and active agency therein, they are also ascribed to the Father and the Son, to denote their concurrence and general co-operation. Hence says the Apostle Paul, in connection with the important passage just quoted, 'Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed: and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.' This verse is quoted, not as expressing the fact we have mentioned, but as introductory to the following verses, and as a key to their meaning. We see here two persons of the Godhead mentioned —the Spirit or Holy Ghost, and the Lord Jesus. Then follow the gifts ascribed both to them and the Father—'Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit (the Holy Ghost). And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord (Jesus Christ). And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God (the Father) which worketh all in all.'—1 Cor. xii. 4—6.

The Holy Ghost calls and authorizes the ambassadors of his mercy, and qualifies them for their work. St Paul, addressing the elders of the church at Ephesus, plainly affirms this, saying, 'Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.' Yet it is God alone who calleth men to the work of the ministry, whether under the Jewish or the Christian economy; for no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron; therefore, seeing the Holy Ghost assumes this office, he is God. Moreover, he so specially superintends the work of the holy ministry, as to select his chosen agents for particular fields of labour; for it is written, 'As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia.'—Acts xiii. 2—4. The Holy Ghost is thus 'the Lord of the harvest,' whose prerogative it is to send forth labourers, and whose interposition and influence we are to seek by prayer for an increase of spiritual labourers. Ministers are his ambassadors,

raised up and qualified by him for their sacred work; and yet they are said to be ambassadors for God. But this special agency of the Spirit does not exclude the agency of the Father and the Son; hence St Paul says in one place, 'Our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament.' And again, 'I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry.'—2 Cor. iii. 5, 6; 1 Tim i. 12. Such phraseology can be consistent only on the principle of an essential unity, as well as personality, existing in the Godhead, so that as each participates in the essence and consciousness of the Divine nature, the actions attributed to one may be applied to the other also.

While the authority of the ministry is derived from the Holy Ghost, so is its success. 'Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord.' 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' He who is Lord of the harvest is giver of the fruit which it yields, whether it be thirty, sixty, or a hundredfold: but he who gives the increase is *God;* for, says Paul, 'I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase.'—1 Cor. iii. 6, 7.

The Holy Ghost raises the dead. He raised the body of Christ from the grave. For though Christ was put to death in the flesh, 'he was quickened by the SPIRIT.' Yet this work is ascribed to the Father. 'Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.' It is ascribed also to the Son himself, for 'Jesus said, Destroy this temple (his body), and in three days I will raise it up.' Evidently the prerogative and work of the whole Trinity—the one God; and in this comprehensive sense the words of Peter are properly understood, when he declares, 'This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses.' —1 Peter iii. 18; Gal. i. 1; John ii. 19; Acts ii. 32.

The Holy Ghost will also raise up the dead bodies of the saints at the last day. 'But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.' Thus it is the Spirit that quickeneth,

and yet the same passage ascribes the work to the agency of the Father also, while other parts of Scripture ascribe the same great event to the Son. For 'all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth.'—Rom. viii. 11; John v. 28, 29. Thus the resurrection of the dead is a work of the Trinity in Unity, and our trust is in the One Living and True God which raiseth the dead.

The supreme majesty of the Holy Ghost is asserted by the Scriptures attaching the deepest malignity to sins committed against Him. The sin of Ananias and Sapphira was one committed against the *Holy Ghost;* a lie, involving hypocrisy against the truth and sincerity he dictated—pride, against the humility he taught—and covetousness, against the glowing benevolence he inspired. This was a sin unto death—so aggravated in its moral turpitude, that the culprits were struck dead upon the spot. Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is still more awful—a sin never to be forgiven either in this world or the world to come. 'Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.'—Matt. xii. 31, 32. It would be irrelevant to enter upon a disquisition on the nature of the particular sin here intended. We believe, with St Ambrose,* that it is maliciously to deny the eternal dignity, majesty, and power of the Holy Ghost, and to ascribe the miracles of Christ, not to the Spirit of God, but to Satanic agency. This appears evident from the context. But the question which bears upon our argument is this, Why should blasphemy against the Spirit be unpardonable, and be thus distinguished from sin against the Father and Son? Can it be because he is a *creature*, an *attribute*, or a *figure of speech?* Such a notion seems almost as impious as it is absurd. If the possibility of sinning against him proves his personality,

* Si quis corporis specie deceptus humani remissius aliquid sentit de Christi carne, quam dignum est, habet culpam; non est tamen exclusus a venia, quam fide possit adsciscere; si quis vero Spiritus sancti dignitatem, majestatem et potestatem abnegat sempiternam, et putat non in spiritu Dei ejici dæmonia, sed in Beelzebub, non potest ibi exoratio esse veniæ, ubi sacrilegii plenitudo est.—*De Spirit. Sanct.*, lib. i. c. 3.

the supremely aggravated nature of this sin proves his supreme Divinity. What is sin but a transgression of the law? and what is sin against the Holy Ghost but a transgression of *His* law? And, if one description of sin, called blasphemy against him, be pronounced unpardonable, it must be a sin of the most aggravated description. Doubtless, the malignant contempt, the inveterate malice and perversity of the heart, involved in this awful sin, constitute its essence; but unless these depraved dispositions were exercised against a Being of infinite glory and majesty, the sin could not be pronounced unpardonable. Nothing can more plainly declare the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, and nothing more solemnly and loudly admonish the captious unbeliever of his dangerous position. He is nearing a vortex which may soon engulf him; he is irreverently trifling with a flaming sword that may soon devour him. Unbelief engenders levity, and levity contempt, and contempt hatred and blasphemy; and then the unbeliever finds the Spirit a consuming fire: the fire that would have illumined and sanctified, destroys him.

The ordinance of Baptism proves the Deity of the Holy Ghost. Having drawn attention to this already in pages 67—72, a few words may suffice to complete the argument which it presents. God has impressed this Christian rite with peculiar sanctity, and made it proclaim the Trinity in Unity in the most prominent manner. The blessed Son sanctioned and honoured the ordinance by submitting to it himself, that he might fulfil all righteousness, and that solemn occasion was distinguished by a special manifestation of the glorious *Three in One.* The favoured herald saw and handled the 'Son;' he also saw the Spirit descending like a dove, emblematical of his gentleness, his benignity, his quickening and fostering influences, whether he broods over matter or mind—whether he transforms chaos into order, harmony, and life, or renovates the dark and degenerate soul into the Divine likeness, filling it with the light of truth, and the energy of love. Then the Baptist hears also the voice of the Father proclaiming from the opened sky, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' To deny the personality of the *Spirit* in this passage, is as wise as to deny the personality of the Father and the Son. To resolve Him who descended into an attribute, could only be paralleled by the folly

of resolving Him who was baptized, and Him whose voice spake from heaven, into an attribute also.

But baptism was enjoined as a permanent ordinance, obligatory upon ministers to perform, and disciples to receive through all ages; and the form of words to be used is prescribed by Divine authority. 'Go ye therefore, and (μαθητεύσατε) disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'—Matt. xxviii. 19.

Now, baptism implies a *profession of faith* in the only true and living God. Who is this God? Not the Father only, but he who is set forth in this solemn form of words as the glorious Three, denominated 'Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' and whoever was baptized publicly avowed his belief in their existence. Baptism, too, implies a *consecration* to God, a dedication of body, soul, and spirit, to his service. To whom, then, is this solemn dedication made? Not to the Father only, but to the glorious three—'the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;' and such a dedication is due to none but God, and if rendered to any creature, it is idolatry. Baptism is also the sign and seal of the *covenant* betwixt God and man; and while man, on the one hand, the subject of baptism, professes to yield up himself to God, to believe in Him, to obey Him, and to glorify Him; on the other hand, God, in whose name he is baptized, engages to accept the homage presented, to bestow the blessings of his grace, and to give himself as the *Covenant-God* of the baptized. But this covenant on the part of God is the covenant not of the Father only, but of the Son, and Holy Spirit; the relationship applies to each person, and therefore establishes the Deity of each. Moreover, this ordinance is said to be performed in the NAME of the EVER BLESSED THREE, and the word Name singular. If this Name signify the *authority* of God, it is the authority of *the three*, for the Name is appropriated to each. If this Name imply the *Divine nature*, it is the nature of *the three*, for the Name is appropriated to each. But this threefold Name is the one which God has chosen, and by which God would have himself to be universally proclaimed and made known by the preaching of the Gospel, and by the ordinance of baptism, and it asserts the Deity of each; for the Name is applied to *the three*: 'Baptizing them in THE NAME of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' The singular form

of the word Jehovah, in connection with the plural Elohim, has already been largely dwelt upon in pages 73—76, and the principle of reasoning there established is applicable to this passage. Here, though the name 'Jehovah Elohim' is no longer used as in the Old Testament, it is plainly resolved into the threefold personal designation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

It must be observed, too, that baptism was from the beginning the gate of entrance into the visible Church, and the form prescribed shows that the Trinity was taught as a *first principle* of Christianity, and was thus inscribed upon the very vestibule of the Christian edifice. St Paul mentions baptism as one of the first principles of the doctrine of the Gospel.—Heb. vi. Wherever apostles and teachers went, they proclaimed the *glorious Three:* therefore, whoever approached the sacred font, had to be instructed in this doctrine; both Jew and Gentile had to profess the ineffable *Name* of 'Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' ere they were enrolled amongst the faithful. However imperfect their knowledge might be of the Christian system as a whole, they were to know this great truth—that the God whom they now worshipped, and to whom they were now dedicated, was the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

In order to invalidate the evidence of the Trinity, as presented in our Lord's commission to baptize, it has been alleged that the apostles baptized in the *name of Jesus;* but this is a frivolous objection, for it is nowhere said that they baptized in the name of *Jesus only;* and it is certain, that if they baptized in the form which Christ had prescribed, they must have baptized in the name of Jesus, for the Son is included in that form. But the fact that the apostles baptized in the name of Jesus, presents satisfactory proof that they baptized in the name of the Spirit also, for there is but one authorized form of Christian baptism, and that form unites the *Spirit* with the Father and the Son. When, therefore, it is stated that they baptized in the name of Jesus, it is to be understood that they administered *Christian baptism*, the baptism which includes the name of Christ in its formula, and was thus distinguished from the baptism of John, and from mere Jewish washings. That this is a correct view of the subject appears quite manifest from the case of the twelve disciples at Ephesus. Paul went to that city, 'and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, Have ye re-

ceived the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.'—Acts xix. 1—5. On this passage we remark, that when St Paul found they had been baptized, and yet had never heard whether there be any Holy Ghost, he was surprised; it was something anomalous; but when he heard they had been baptized *only* with John's baptism, the mystery was explained; for they had not been baptized in the name of Jesus, or with Christian baptism. This clearly implies, that had they been baptized in the name of Jesus, they would have heard of the Holy Ghost—they might not indeed have received him, but they would certainly have heard of Him, as his name is included in the rite of Christian baptism. Thus, to be baptized in the name of Jesus, is synonymous with being baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The twelve Ephesian disciples were afterwards thus baptized, yet the narrative simply states—'When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of Jesus,' ver. 5. This form of sound words, as commanded by our Saviour, has been observed by the Christian Church in all ages. Justin Martyr, who lived shortly after the apostles, says, 'Whoever can be persuaded, and believe that these things which are taught and asserted by us are true, are brought to us to a place where there is water, and regenerated according to the rite of regeneration, by which we ourselves have been born again. For then are they washed in the water, in the name of God the Father and Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost.' Tertullian also observes, 'The law of baptism is enjoined, and the form prescribed, Go and teach the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit.' It was the custom with adults in the primitive times, when baptized, to profess their faith in the Trinity, by saying, 'I believe in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.'

As another proof of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, he was

worshipped. Were the Holy Spirit a creature, HE would owe worship to the Creator; but we never find *him* engaged in this exercise. Our Lord worshipped the Father while on earth, for this was conformable to his humbled condition, and requisite to the perfection of his example; but we never find Christ worshipping, either before his incarnation, or after his ascension. The Holy Spirit, however, is *never* described as engaged in worship, either in earth or in heaven. On the contrary, he himself is worshipped and adored by all the Church of God, and by the highest orders of beings in the celestial world. In the apostolic benediction he is worshipped and prayed to for the blessings of his holy communion. Under the dim and shadowy dispensation of ancient Israel, the Triune God was also worshipped, though not with so clear and formal a recognition of the persons as was afterwards revealed to man. The trinal form of blessing required to be pronounced by the Jewish high priest had doubtless a reference to the Three Persons in the Godhead. 'Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, saying, On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, Jehovah bless thee, and keep thee: Jehovah make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: Jehovah lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.' And then it is added, 'And they shall put MY NAME upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them.'—Numb. vi. 23—26. On this passage we remark—1. That here a specific form of blessing is prescribed by God himself. 2. That this form of blessing involves a *threefold* repetition of the name *Jehovah.* 3. That this threefold repetition is connected with the declaration, that God's *Name* is thus to be put upon the children of Israel. 4. This declaration seems to imply that the repetition of the Word Jehovah and the manifestation of the *Divine Name*, or the Divine nature, were in some way necessarily connected. These truths lie plainly on the surface of the passage, without borrowing their explanation from any subsequent revelations; and while they are in perfect harmony with the doctrine of the Trinity, they cannot be so rationally accounted for or explained on any other principle. God loves not vain repetitions; he forbids them; and we cannot, therefore, admit that he has taught men to employ this repetition of his venerable Name in vain. God has a reason for all that he does, and a meaning for all that he

ays, and such are always worthy of himself. Such a reason is ound in the doctrine of the Trinity, and such a meaning ttached to the repetition of his holy Name in this benediction s in perfect harmony with the personal names which God has pplied to himself in subsequent revelations; and when it is emembered that the whole volume of the Old and New Tes- ament forms but one system of successive and gradual dis- losure of himself to mankind, we cannot but regard the three- old repetition of the name Jehovah as designed to emit some leams of light upon his own Divine nature. The connection etween this passage and the formula of baptism, and the postolic benediction, is remarkable and striking. If in the ewish form of blessing there is not the appropriation of the ersonal designation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, there is verything but this. There is nothing but this wanting to ender the parallel complete. The name Jehovah is thrice epeated *instead* of those designations; and this repetition has reason assigned for it—that the *Name* of God might be put pon the people. Besides, the words include a solemn prayer o God, offered by the chief minister of religion, in behalf of he people; and precisely such is the apostolic benediction. gain, it is remarkable that the prayer includes petitions for uch blessings as are comprised in the apostolic benediction, nd correspond with the same. Let each member of the two ormulas be compared, and their correspondence will be at nce apparent.*

'Jehovah (the Father) bless thee, and keep thee.'

'The love of God be with you.'

'Jehovah (the Son) make his face to shine upon thee, and e gracious unto thee.'

'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.'

* In reference to the Jewish benediction, Jones has well remarked, 'If the ree articles of this benediction be attentively considered, their contents will be nd to agree respectively to the Three Persons taken in the usual order of e Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The Father is the author of blessing and eservation. Grace and illumination are from the Son, by whom we have the ht of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Peace is gift of the Spirit, whose name is the Comforter.' Dr Pye Smith has also served, 'The first member of the formula expresses the benevolent love of God, Father of mercies, and fountain of all good; the second well comports with redeeming grace of our Lord Jesus Christ; and the last is appropriate to the ity, consolation, and joy which are received from the communion of the Holy rit.'

'Jehovah (the Spirit) lift up the light of his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.'

'The communion of the Holy Ghost be with you.'

The coincidence and parallel exhibited in this comparison are too manifest to be overlooked by the serious reader, and clearly show, that He who under the Jewish and Christian dispensations prescribed these forms for the religious use of his servants, intended thereby to impress them in their most serious devotions with suitable ideas of his own nature.

In further consideration of this view, it is observable that while the Apostle Paul *concludes* his Epistle to the Corinthians with this threefold benediction, St John is taught to *open* his solemn revelations to the Seven Churches with this same form of blessing: 'Grace be unto you, and peace, from Him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne; and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth.' Here the Son is set before us in his ordinary name, Jesus Christ the Saviour of men; and the Father is presented under a periphrasis, equivalent to Jehovah, viz., 'He who is, who was, and who is to come;' and the Holy Ghost is set forth by the figurative designation of the 'seven Spirits.' Unitarian writers have endeavoured to resolve the 'seven Spirits' into seven angels or ministering spirits; but a very brief investigation will show that this notion is totally inadmissible. Angels are creatures, and, as creatures, they ascribe their existence to God, and worship him. But the 'seven Spirits' are never described as creatures, are never found assuming either the attitude or the language of worship; and thus they are plainly distinguished from all creatures, however highly exalted. In another passage, Rev. v. 6, the seven Spirits are set forth as the horns and eyes of the Lamb; but this representation is too exalted for angels, and can only apply to the Holy Ghost. The horn is the emblem of the power, and the eye an emblem of the wisdom of Christ; and it is not through the agency of angels, but through the agency of the *Holy Spirit*, that the power and wisdom of Christ are displayed in the Gospel; as on the day of Pentecost, and in every instance when Christ is glorified in the salvation of souls. In another instance, Rev. iv. 5, the

even Spirits are set forth as 'seven lamps of fire burning be-
ore the throne.' Fire is an emblem under which the Holy
Ghost is frequently represented, and is expressive of his
nlightening and purifying influences. When he was given on
he day of Pentecost, fire was his emblem. The number seven
s used in allusion to the golden *candelabrum* of the sanctuary,
vith its seven branches, constantly supplied with holy oil, and
ielding its pure and steady light, the instructive emblem of
he Spirit's unction and illumination. The number seven, too,
n the Hebrew language (the idiom of which is here preserved,
lthough the Apostle wrote in Greek), signifies fulness, pleni-
ude, perfection; and hence the 'seven Spirits' signify the
Holy Ghost in the plenitude and perfection of his heavenly
nfluences. Thus the passage before us applies to the Holy
Ghost, who is here invested with Divine prerogatives, and
nited with the Father and the Son as the object of worship,
nd the fountain of grace and peace. From the Triune God,
hen, the apostles sought by prayer the spiritual blessings of
race and peace for the churches to which they wrote. They
ought these blessings from them conjointly, because they had
hem to bestow; and they had them to bestow, because con-
jointly they constitute the glorious Godhead.

Divine worship is also ascribed to the Holy Ghost by the
ngels in heaven. We have before proved that in the vision
f Isaiah (chap. vi.) the representation of Jehovah's glory
pplies to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and those arguments
eed not be repeated. But in the same representation we
ave the seraphim employed in worship, and their ascriptions
praise are threefold, corresponding with the persons in the
odhead. They veil their faces with their wings, and cry one
another, 'Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts: the whole
rth is full of his glory.' As Origen observes, 'They are not
ntent to say it once or twice, but take the perfect number
the Trinity, thereby to declare the manifold holiness of God,
hich is a repeated intercommunion of a threefold holiness:
e holiness of the Father, the holiness of the only-begotten
n, and of the Holy Ghost.' Now, since the testimony of
e Scripture itself shows that the representation of Jehovah
plies to the glorious Three, there is no room for conjecture
to the reason for the threefold ascription of praise uttered

by the seraphim. Their praise as certainly applies to each person as the Scriptures themselves prove the presence and glory of each person. It should be remembered, too, that this praise was rendered in the heavenly temple. The threefold *benediction* of the high priest was pronounced in the *earthly* temple made with hands, which was a figure of the true; but here a threefold *ascription of praise and glory* is rendered in the temple not made with hands. The one tribute of praise was pronounced by men, the latter is proclaimed by the seraphim—the highest order of angelic beings.

In the fourth chapter of Revelation we have a fuller description of heaven, and of the worship which the various orders of happy beings render to the Triune God. The favoured Apostle beholds heaven opened, and there the Glorious Three are emblematically represented to his eye. Around these emblems of the glorious Trinity there are various orders and countless numbers of happy worshippers—the living ones, or seraphim and cherubim, the elders arrayed in spotless robes, and the multitude of angels. The living ones here, like the seraphim in Isaiah, utter the same threefold ascription of praise. 'They rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.' The elders and the angels round about the throne praise him with a loud voice, and eternally glorify God and the Lamb.

We have now completed our chain of argument for the Deity of the Holy Spirit, and the reader will see that we have established this important doctrine by the same process of reasoning as that by which we had previously established the Deity of Christ; and the arguments adduced for the Godhead of both the Saviour and the Spirit, are those by which alone the Deity of the Father himself can be established. To deny the validity of these arguments for the Deity of the Son and Spirit, is to deny the Deity of the Father also; for there is no other argument by which his Deity can be proved. If the names, the attributes, the works, and the prerogatives of God do not establish his claim to supreme Divinity, there is no alternative but to deny his existence, and plunge at once into atheism. This reasoning supplies an infallible test of the truth of the Holy Trinity, and of the absurdity and impiety of the Unitarian hypothesis.

The only sophism by which the Unitarian seeks to evade his conclusion is to allege that certain passages in Scripture scribe to *man* powers and prerogatives, which, if understood terally, would deify him. Hence, Dr Channing refers to in-ances where men are said to be partakers of the Divine ature, to know and possess all things, and to be filled with all od's fulness. That believers are made partakers of God's oral nature, being renewed in righteousness and holiness in hrist, is true; that they are instructed by the Holy Spirit to now their duty, is true; that they possess all spiritual bless-gs, is true; and that it is their privilege to be filled with od, is also true: but in what sense do these privileges invest em with the prerogatives of God, or express any semblance an equality with Deity? In no sense in which we are able conceive. If the reasoning of Channing have any weight, must be shown that the representations of Scripture in re-rence to *man* are *parallel* to the representations of Scripture reference to the Saviour and the Holy Spirit. If there is no rallel, the argument has no weight; it is good for nothing; is a mere sophism. To explode the sophism and to show its tter absurdity, we have only to require the Unitarian to hibit the parallel. Show us where man is called Jehovah—hovah God, Jehovah God of Hosts, Jehovah God of Israel. ow us where man is said to have the attributes of eternity, nipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, and immutability. ow us where man is said to have created all worlds, and is be worshipped and adored by all intelligent beings. Then, l not till then, shall we have such a parallel. Every one l see that if such a parallel could be exhibited it would in-ve consequences fatal to every mode of argument for the ex-nce of a Supreme Deity, and annihilate all distinction between creature and the Creator—between finite dependent beings, the infinite and independent Jehovah. It would either ve that all men are gods, or disprove the existence of one ovah. It would either convert the universe into a pan-on of deities, or exclude altogether from the universe the per idea of a Deity. It is unnecessary to say that such a allel never can be exhibited; but pitiful is the sophistry ch assumes it. The distinction between God and the creature verywhere obvious; and so long as that distinction remains,

the arguments for the Deity of the Son and Holy Spirit must be immovable—they are a rock of eternal adamant; the boisterous waves of Unitarian sophistry may dash themselves against it, but they are resisted and broken into harmless spray.

Our argument might easily have been extended, but it was our desire to furnish such a brief view of the scriptural proofs of the Holy Trinity as would enable the serious Christian to give to every man a reason for the hope that is in him, and guard him against the cunning craftiness and wily sophistry of designing men who lie in wait to deceive. In conformity with this simple object, we have studiously avoided the use of scholastic terms and artificial distinctions; and, for the same reason, have but sparingly quoted the writings of the Fathers; although from their testimonies a volume might be compiled, showing that in every age this doctrine has been held, and the same passages quoted in its support, as those used by the orthodox believers of the present day. But the Scriptures being the only standard of appeal, it is on their infallible testimony alone we rely with implicit confidence. To the law and to the testimony we refer; if men speak not according to this, it is because there is no light in them. One passage from God's holy Word can overthrow a thousand sophisms; and one solemn asseveration of 'Thus saith the Lord,' is a reply to all the objections which a vain and inflated philosophy can allege. We would submit our understanding and judgment, as well as our conscience and affections, to the guidance of the Bible; assured, that while this is required by the Gospel as an act of 'the obedience of faith,' it is a dictate of the soundest philosophy, and the highest office of reason. Instinct and revelation are both from God, and while the one is his directing hand, the other is his instructing voice—what the one performs for the inferior tribes, the other is intended to do for the intelligent race. With Jehovah for our guide, we shall be led into all truth, and our faith be at last rewarded with eternally brightening manifestations of his will, his perfections, his purposes, his love.*

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. Amen.

* That this doctrine of the Holy Trinity is in perfect harmony with reason, and sustained by the decisions of reason, see the Third Book of the author's volume on 'THE DEITY.'

CHAPTER VI.

THE ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN, AND HUMAN DEPRAVITY.

HAT man, in his present state, is not what he was when he ame from the hand of his Creator, is a truth so obvious to rea- on that it has been admitted by observant minds in all ages and ountries. Whether we contemplate him as a citizen of the atural, the moral, or intellectual world, he appears with evi- ent indications of being a fallen creature, and an object of ivine displeasure. He enters the world under circumstances suffering and peril; he passes through it a subject of sorrow, il, and affliction; and leaves it often with a convulsive groan, victim of death, a prey to worms and corruption. In his body is subject to innumerable pains, diseases, and dangers, and ery moment exposed to the shafts of mortality; in his spirit- l nature he is the dupe of ignorance and sin. Beclouded in s understanding, feeble in his judgment, perverse in his will, d corrupt in his affections, he becomes a slave to his passions; if restrained by counsel, example, or authority, from the xtremes of depravity, he still remains (unless grace effect a hange) an alien to God, and a stranger to solid peace and isfaction. With an immortal nature, his tendencies are rthly; with capacities for boundless attainments, he is ab- bed and infatuated with a bauble; with an instinctive love life, he is harassed by the constant dread of death; with a st for happiness, he is naturally impelled to a course which ils upon him misery and destruction.

With these facts before us, we ask, what is their cause? Do se results necessarily flow from the original constitution of n's physical and moral nature? Can we attach the blame is Creator, by supposing that He at first formed man, in body, a subject of disease and mortality; in his soul, a vic- to sin and misery? From such a supposition reason recoils n abhorrence. To entertain this would be to do violence to plainest dictates of the human mind; for it would be to pose that God, who is a Being of absolute purity, is the

sole author of sin—that God, a Being of boundless benevolence, is the originator of all the misery which exists ; which supposition would be both absurd and blasphemous. Even the unenlightened heathen never ascribed the origin of evil to the Supreme Deity ; although, in their attempts to account for it, they were lost in fabulous and erroneous speculations.

The truth is, although reason may determine that man's original state could not be what it is at present, and that God himself could not be the author of human misery, yet it was incompetent to discover the primeval state of man, or the cause of that melancholy change he has experienced. This mournful subject has indeed often been a theme of the poet's dirge and the philosopher's speculation, even in heathen countries ; but their views present a strange and incoherent mixture of truth and fiction—what is true being evidently borrowed from authentic tradition or revelation ; and what is fabulous, the inventions of minds which sought to supply by conjecture such vacancies as lost or faded truth had left on the canvas of history. Even as an ancient painting of Raphael, Rubens, or some great master, when defaced by age, or torn into shreds by violence, but rudely put together, and filled up by the pencil of some rash and unskilful hand, presents only a caricature of the proportion, harmony, and breathing genius of the original ; so the discordant theories of heathen cosmogonists have more of contrast than resemblance to the simple narrative of the inspired volume. When Euryalus declares that man was made in the image of God—when Ovid makes the same assertion—when Cicero speaks of man as created erect, as if God excited him to look up to his former relation and ancient abode—when Catullus represents the unhallowed period in which justice was put to flight, and men imbrued their hands in fraternal blood, and various crimes alienated the mind of God from mankind—when Tacitus traces the progress of depravity from a period of innocence to flagitious and abandoned wickedness ; and when poets and historians generally speak of a gradual deterioration from age to age—of a change from a golden era of innocence to an iron depravity*—we can clearly perceive the general outlines of sacred truth ; but as heathen writers blend their narrations with the most extravagant fictions, we see the truth so dis-

* Grey's Connexion.

rted, obscured, and corrupted by human invention, as to bear
ıt a distant resemblance to the Divine original. In the Bible
one, therefore, we have a true account of the original state of
an, and the cause of his defection and misery. Here we have
fallible certainty united with the highest antiquity; we are
d by the hand, and instructed by the voice of our heavenly
ather, and it is equally our duty and our privilege to listen
his teachings.

From the first chapter of Genesis we learn that as man was
e noblest, so he was the last of the Creator's works. The
ansion was first constructed and furnished, and then its in-
bitant was formed. This was congruous to the order and
ness of things, and to the dignified position of man as lord of
is lower creation. The world would have been incomplete
thout man. All the works of Jehovah were indeed worthy
him—good in their nature, and perfect in their kind; and
looked upon them with complacency. In all these there were
splays of wisdom, power, and benevolence; but without man
ere was no mind to contemplate them; no being capable of
ing God in his works, and adoring him as their Author; no
ing whose intellect could trace the wonderful effects in the
iverse to their cause—who could perceive the adaptations of
sdom, the provisions of benevolence, or the exhibitions of
ver. Nor was there a mind susceptible of moral emotions:
one that could understand God's will, or receive his law,
commune with his Spirit; not one who could render him
untary homage, or send forth to him an aspiration of grati-
e, devotion, and love; indeed, not one to enjoy the presence
his Maker, or be conscious of his existence. This desider-
m Jehovah supplied in the creation of man.

'And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our
ness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea,
over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all
earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the
h. So God created man in his own image, in the image of
l created he him; male and female created he them.' In
her passage it is added, 'And the Lord God formed man
he dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the
th of life; and man became a living soul.'—Gen. i. 26, 27;
. The language employed in this account of the origin of

man expresses his importance in the creation, his twofold nature, and his primeval rectitude.

In reference to his creation there was a consultation in the Godhead—'And God said, Let us make man'—phraseology which is peculiar, and applied to the creation of no other being but man. Gregory Nyssen observes, that 'the superiority of man to all other parts of creation is seen in this, that all other creatures are represented as the effect of God's *word*, but man is represented as the *work* of God, according to plan and consideration—"Let US make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness."' Matthew Henry remarks, 'In the creation of other things God speaks with *authority*, but in the creation of man he speaks with affection—"*Let* US *make man*."' * It is, doubtless, one instance out of many supplied by the Holy Scriptures, in which God has expressed the importance of man above all his other works. Man was formed to be lord of this lower world, to hold communion with the Triune God, and enjoy an immortal existence; his creation, therefore, was distinguished and honoured by a consultation of the Godhead.

He was formed of a twofold nature, body and soul. The former, like that of the inferior animals, was derived from the dust of the earth, but the latter was produced by a Divine *inflatus*—God breathed into his nostrils the breath of *lives* (חיים) and man became a living soul—a being possessing a rational and an immortal spirit. Yet these two substances, body and spirit, so diverse in their nature and properties, and brought into existence by separate modes of Divine operation, are so intimately united as to form but one person—one conscious being.

The same text informs us that man was made in the image and likeness of God. God is a spirit, and it was the *spirit* of man that was formed in the likeness of God. We cannot conceive how a *body* could be formed in the image of a spirit, but we may conceive it possible for one spirit to resemble another. The soul of man, like its Divine and glorious Author, was made spiritual in its nature, and immortal in its duration—made in the image of God's spirituality and eternity. It was made like God, too, in its intellectual faculties, having understanding, will, and active power, and this is what divines call 'the natural image of God in his creature.'

* See Clarke and Henry *in loco*.

But the language of the inspired writer has especial reference to the *moral* image and likeness of God; and what is meant by the image in this sense may be easily understood from parallel passages of Scripture. The wise man says, 'Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions' (Eccles. vii. 29); from which it is obvious that the original state of man was a state of uprightness, and in this consisted his moral resemblance to the Creator. The image of God is referred to in the New Testament, and in conformity with the above passage, it implies a state of moral rectitude. Thus, St Paul describes believers as having 'put off the old man with his deeds, and put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.'—Col. iii. 9, 10. Again, he exhorts believers in similar language: 'That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.'—Eph. iv. 22—24. From these scriptures we clearly see what is the moral image of God. It is a state of *uprightness*, as opposed to carnal *inventions*—sinister purposes, corrupt designs, foolish and deceitful schemes of happiness. It is a state of Divine *knowledge*—a knowledge and approbation of God and his holy will, as opposed to the ignorance and alienation which characterize our degenerate state. It is a state of *righteousness* and *true holiness*, contrasted with corrupt conversation and deceitful lusts.

From these and other intimations of man's original state, we see that he was a being of exalted moral excellence and intellectual capacity—a creature endowed with great and glorious perfections. His understanding was bright, vigorous, and comprehensive; free from the bewildering mists of prejudice, and intuitively stored with knowledge. His knowledge of Nature manifest from his giving an appropriate name to the creatures brought before him, a name significant of the peculiar properties and habits of each species. His knowledge of the Creator's will concerning him—of the love, worship, and obedience he owed to him—was clear, correct, and adequate to his station, an intelligent though dependent creature. His memory was quick and retentive. His conscience, free from the stains of

guilt, and a stranger to remorse, was a perfect transcript of the Divine law—the faithful vicegerent of Heaven in his soul. His will was in strict conformity to the will of his Maker. His affections were pure and spiritual, habitually tending towards God, fixed upon him with supreme ardour and delight, as the Author of his being and the Fountain of his happiness. His earthly passions calm, his animal appetites temperate; and both were subordinate to the nobler faculties of his nature, and the higher principles and objects of his existence. He was filled with his Maker's Spirit; he rejoiced in His favour; he reflected His image; he loved Him with all his powers; he was fitted to glorify Him for ever. His Maker pronounced him good—*very good*—a declaration which implies the absence of all evil, and the possession of every excellence—physical, intellectual, and moral—which his nature as a man, and his condition as a free agent, could admit. Yet this good was capable of enhancement, and his continuance in obedience was designed to secure that result. His mind, like that of the angels, was formed for continual expansion, refinement, and elevation, and his life for perpetual exaltation in worth, usefulness, and honour.

With these endowments man was placed in Paradise—a garden of delight, as the original expresses it—a sacred spot, selected and specially prepared by God himself, as the appropriate and happy residence of his new-formed creature. 'Here man passed the days of his innocence, in a region which formed no unhappy resemblance to heaven itself; surrounded by all that was good for food, pleasant to the eye, and fragrant to the smell; in an atmosphere impregnated with life; amidst streams in which life flowed; amidst fruits and flowers in which life bloomed and ripened; encircled with ever-living beauty and magnificence. To him the various displays of wisdom, power, and benevolence around him were illustrious sources of pleasure. Wherever his eye turned its glance, he saw the Deity, and he saw him with delight. The universe itself was one vast mirror, in which he beheld reflected every moment, in every form, the glory, the majesty, the goodness of God; while to him his prayers and praises arose more fragrant than the incense of the morning, and formed no unhappy harmony with the loftier music of heaven.' *

* Dr Dwight.

But man was placed in a state of probation; and this was perfectly compatible with the attributes of his nature, and the goodness of his Maker, who had so highly distinguished him from all his other works. As a rational being and a free agent, he was a proper subject for moral government; and as a creature deriving his existence and happiness from God, he was laid under the most powerful obligations to love and obey him. He was therefore subject to law, and his fidelity tested. Scope was thus afforded for the free exercise of his moral powers, and an opportunity given for the development of high practical excellence, and habits of holy obedience. The general law of his existence was that of love—a law which includes the *principle* of all obedience, and one to which the whole intelligent creation must be subject, whatever be their rank or condition. The command, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself,' involves a *principle* of obedience, as applicable to Adam in Paradise, and to angels in heaven, as to man in his present state. But the injunction of a special or *positive* precept is quite compatible with this general law of obedience, and, indeed, is often made the means or instrument by which our obedience of heart is tested and made manifest. Thus, the ritual of the Jewish law included many positive precepts; thus, the command to Abraham to sacrifice his son was a positive precept and a test of his love; and thus the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are positive precepts enjoined upon us; and our observance of these positive or special precepts is made a test of our obedience to the general principle of love. 'If ye love me,' says the Redeemer, 'keep my commandments.'

Man, in his original state, was made subject to a special prohibitory precept, as prescribed in the following passage: 'And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.'—Gen. ii. 16, 17. This prohibition, as a law of man's probationary state, has often been the butt of the infidel's ridicule: indeed, what truth is there in the Bible which humbles the pride of the carnal man, puts a restraint upon his passions, and menaces him with God's displeasure against sin, which has not in its turn

been made the fool's jest and the unbeliever's scorn? The Christian, however, is not to be cheated out of his faith by the sneers of the profane sophist. He knows that he has not followed cunningly-devised fables, and is not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ. The conditions of Adam's probationary state in Paradise have only to be examined to show forth the justice, the wisdom, and the benevolence, too, of Him who imposed them.

The conditions enjoined upon man were *just*. Justice has respect to mutual rights, and mutual rights arise from the relations in which we stand. The relation of man to God was that of a creature to the Creator—a creature deriving both his existence and happiness from God. What, then, were the rights growing out of this relationship? On behalf of God, justice demanded the implicit homage, the unreserved obedience of man. On behalf of man, justice could require at the utmost no more than a supply of his necessities from God. What principle of justice, then, was violated in the conditions imposed upon man? If justice required from him unreserved obedience, was it *unjust* to make him subject to *one* prescriptive command? If justice required for man merely the supply of his necessities, was it unjust to place him under *one* restraint, with all the enjoyments and delights of Paradise at his command? Common sense will supply an answer. But it may further be inquired, Was it just to connect so great a penalty with so small an offence? We reply, The offence was *not* small. The restraint was small, but the sin was great, intensely aggravated by the smallness of the restraint; and, as we shall hereafter show, involved a breach of the whole moral law; and if justice require any sin to be punished, it was specially demanded here. No argument, then, can be alleged against the penalty attached to this positive precept, which does not apply against the punishment of any violation of the moral law of God; and to argue against the punishment of sin, is to argue against the government of God in general; and to argue against the government of God, is to argue against the holiness of his nature—against the perfections of his character; in effect, against his *existence* as God, and against all distinctions betwixt good and evil, holiness and sin.

The prohibition was *wise* as well as just. The majesty of

the infidel's intellect is offended at the Scripture narrative, which represents the Deity as legislating about so trifling a matter as man's not eating the fruit of a particular tree. What egregious folly thus to reason, as if things were great or small in the estimation of God, just as they are in the estimation of men! What egregious folly, also, to consider an event apart from the principles it involves! If the giving of a cup of cold water involves the principle of love to Christ, it *is* important—it secures his approbation; and if the eating of fruit involved rebellion against God, it could not be a trivial event: the principle of disobedience was there, the law of love to God was violated, and the act of transgression involved as much guilt as if it had shaken the globe, and removed mountains from their foundations. Satan did not deem the act trivial when he employed all his infernal subtlety to induce man to commit it. But the folly of man begets its contraries. When a duty requires some laborious effort—some painful sacrifice—it is pronounced intolerable and unjust; but when it consists in some simple and easy act, it is declared trivial and inconsistent with the dignity of God to require it. Thus, the command to sell all that he had and give to the poor, was a sacrifice too great for the young nobleman, and he went away sorrowing; but merely to wash in Jordan and be clean, was despicable to the haughty Syrian leper. So, the restraint of a single tree in Paradise is deemed trifling and foolish; but the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men. God's ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts; but his ways are always worthy of himself, and his wisdom shines forth in those simple requirements against which the carnal mind complains. If a positive precept must be prescribed for man's obedience in Paradise, we cannot conceive of one more perfectly adapted to man's situation, or better fitted to test his fidelity.

As an inhabitant of Eden—as an innocent and holy being—it is manifest that any positive precept adapted to him, as a test of obedience, must be widely different from most of those contained in the Decalogue, or to any other peculiar to man in his present condition. The prohibition of the fruit of a certain tree, standing conspicuously in the midst of the garden, corresponded exactly with his rural situation and his daily engage-

ments and recreations. It served, too, as a constant visible monition of his dependence upon God, and his obligation to him for all the good he enjoyed. This restraint reminded him that he was under a law to his Maker; that, though lord of the creation, he was in subjection to the authority of God. It intimated to him that he had higher interests than those of the flesh to secure; that obedience was to be preferred to sensual indulgence; and that the favour of God was infinitely more important than any earthly advantage. Besides, it concentrated man's obedience into a single point, and rendered it obvious to his understanding, and easy to be obeyed. Such important purposes was this simple precept calculated to serve, and they were worthy the wisdom of the Creator.

The nature of the precept indicated also the *benevolence* of God. It is the province of Divine benevolence to bestow blessings and favours; to distinguish man's condition by favourable circumstances beyond what mere justice might require. It was benevolence which induced God to create man so noble, dignified, and happy in his nature. It was benevolence which imposed upon man only *one* restraint amidst all the variety and profusion of the fruits of Paradise; since justice might have forbidden the use of many. It was benevolence which rendered man's obedience so easy, and the motives to it so numerous and powerful. It was benevolence which admonished man of his danger; as, doubtless, punishment is a *necessary* consequence of sin, and not an arbitrary infliction—as much the natural and necessary result of sin as heat from fire, as pain from concussion, or any result from the physical laws of Nature. It was, therefore, benevolent in God to warn man of the consequences of sin, for the threatening implied his desire that man should avert it. It was benevolence, too, which rendered man's obedience rewardable; which annexed enjoyment and immortality to his duty; which bound his duty and his interests together, and thus made his instinctive love of life and happiness supply inducements to fidelity. The whole economy exhibits God speaking to man in the accents of truth and love, showing sin to be hateful because it was hurtful, throwing around holiness all the attractions of happiness, and persuading man to continue in obedience, that he might be eternally blessed. Such, then, was the condition of man, and

such the justice, the wisdom, and goodness which God displayed in this economy. While no violence was done to man's free agency, yet, for his preservation in innocence and happiness, every provision was made, compatible with his moral freedom and his probationary state.

The temptation which led to the awful event of man's apostasy is but briefly recorded, yet it is fraught with instruction. 'Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.'—Gen. iii. 1—6.

The instrument employed in this dreadful scheme of guilt and ruin was a creature called the serpent, in the original (נחש) *Nachash*, a word of extensive signification. This creature must have differed widely in its form and habits from the reptile now bearing that name, as is evident from the change it underwent, and is expressed in the curse pronounced upon it. The *agent*, however, was Satan, the chief of the fallen angels, who, envying the innocence and happiness of our first parents, and filled with malice and hatred against God, entered into this creature, in order the more effectually to accomplish his deadly purpose—man's rebellion against God, and his consequent misery. This is not a conjecture; for, while both the malignity of the design and the subtlety of the temptation evince the presence of an agent of the deepest depravity and the most consummate intelligence, the Scriptures plainly inform us that that agent was the prince of darkness. Hence, in allusion to this transaction, he is called the serpent: 'And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth

the whole world.'—Rev. xii. 9; xx. 2. In allusion to the deceit and cruelty manifest in the seduction of our first parents, he is called a liar and a murderer from the beginning. 'Ye are of your father the devil, and his works ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth: because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.' As it was his stratagem which introduced rebellion into our world, so all sin is called 'the work of the devil,' and is referred to him as its originator and promoter. 'He that committeth sin is of the devil, for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.' Thus, Satan is the deceiver and destroyer of men, and Christ is their Redeemer and Saviour.

The scheme of the tempter was deeply laid, and most artfully adapted to accomplish his awful purpose. Though, probably, but a part of the temptation is narrated, enough is written to show 'the cunning craftiness' of the apostate spirit. To secure attention and prevent suspicion, he begins the device by simple inquiry, as if interested in the welfare of the happy pair. 'Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?' Having received from the mother of our race a reply, from which he could perceive that attention was gained, he proceeds, presenting the bait in every form that could allure the appetites of the body, or excite the desires of the mind. He praises the qualities of the fruit as 'good for food and pleasant to the eye'—why, then, should it be forbidden? He strengthens the temptation by an appeal to the higher powers and propensities of her nature. The food, he says, is the means of giving wisdom. 'God has endued you with capacities for higher attainments in knowledge, and given you an instinctive desire for its possession; if these endowments are good, why not the means which lead to their perfection? Eat, and ye shall know the hidden virtues of this fruit; ye shall be raised to a higher state; ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.' These were strong inducements; but, on the other hand, there were powerful motives and principles which presented a resistance. These, however, were assailed in their turn by suggestions of another class. Our first parents were held to obedience by

their faith in God's word—this principle the tempter endeavours to loosen by undermining God's veracity. 'Ye shall not surely die.' They were held to their obedience by the principle of love to God. They regarded him as infinitely amiable and benevolent, and worthy of that supreme affection which they yielded to him. The tempter sought to weaken this affection by insinuating that God was not so benevolent or so worthy of their love as they supposed, for that he had unnecessarily placed them under restraint, and, through a motive of selfishness, had denied them the fruit which he knew would accelerate their exaltation in wisdom and happiness. They were held to their obedience, also, by their love of life and their dread of death. This the seducer met by engendering a spirit of security, assuring them that they could not die. Thus assailed, they listened: curiosity was awakened, desire excited, and their principles yielded. Their confidence in God sunk before the tempter's suggestions; their love for God faded in the prospect of lawless independence and elevation; and their dread of death vanished in their unbelief of the threatened vengeance. They fell: the woman deceived by the tempter's guile, and the man by that and his ardent attachment to his fallen partner.

In the revolt we are now contemplating, there was, as we have already proved, an awful amount of guilt contracted. The violation of the positive injunction comprehended a breach of the whole law of love. There was unbelief—a principle which makes God a liar—a transfer of his confidence from God to a malignant and an apostate spirit. This is incompatible with love. There was ingratitude, and discontent with the rich provision God had made for his welfare and happiness. There was pride—a desire for elevation by unlawful means. There was self-will and insubordination to God. There was alienation of heart, engendered by receiving the calumnies which the tempter cast upon God. And finally, there was a renunciation of the authority and government of God, and a practical avowal of hostility against him.

Such was the sin, and the penalty originally threatened was death. 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die:' a threatening including the dissolution of the body, the moral corruption of the soul by the withdrawal of the Divine favour and the Holy Spirit, and an eternal banishment from God. The

full and immediate infliction of this last penalty was, however, arrested by the interposition of mercy, with an economy of grace and restoration. The consequences of sin being mitigated, the judgment pronounced upon the offenders was modified, and man's probation, under new circumstances, was continued.

The consequences of the fall, as stated by the sacred historian, are thus narrated:—'And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons. And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden. And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou? And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself. And he said, Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat? And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat. And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it (he) shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground: for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return. Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the

ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.'—Gen. iii.

Before we analyze the melancholy effects of sin detailed in this passage, the interposition of mercy claims our attention, for this sheds a ray of light and hope upon the gloomy catastrophe. This mercy first appears in God's seeking man. When the guilty pair fled from their Maker, the voice of God called back the wanderers, and before a sentence of punishment was pronounced against them, the revelation of a Saviour was given, and the charter of redemption was unfolded. Here was mercy. The menace against the tempter contains a prediction of salvation to man. Here was mercy. The destruction of Satan's empire announces the triumph of man's deliverer. Here again was mercy. For an elaborate explanation of this interesting passage, containing the first promise of the Messiah, we have not space; but we may briefly remark that the Seed of the woman was the name given to our Lord, in anticipation of his incarnation. The serpent's head indicates the authority and kingdom of Satan, and the bruising of that head implies the total overthrow of his usurped dominion. The bruising of the heel prefigures the sufferings of the Saviour, in the accomplishment of Satan's destruction and human salvation; for he was to be wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities. These emblems are very appropriate and expressive. When Epaminondas, a Grecian general, wished to show his soldiers that they might easily overcome the army of the enemy, if they could once vanquish the Spartans who led the van, he did this by crushing the head of a large serpent in their presence, and then showing them that the rest of its body had no power. The first promise of a Saviour has travelled over the world, and been preserved through all ages of time. Two sculptured figures are yet extant in one of the oldest pagodas of the Hindoos: one representing Krishna, an incarnation of the god Vishnu, trampling on the crushed head of a serpent; the other representing the serpent encircling the deity in its folds, and biting his heel.

This ancient promise, though obscure and enigmatical, contains those germs of truth which future ages and dispensations

were to unfold. It was a faint outline of the economy of grace. It was the Gospel in embryo. It was the tree of life with its fruit in the bud. It was a rich nebula, which subsequent revelations were to brighten and expand into a hemisphere of light and glory. It was the star of hope which shot forth its mild and gentle beams upon the horizon of our world on that dark and cloudy day, when storms of vengeance threatened immediate destruction to the transgressor. How far this promise of mercy was understood by our first parents we are unable to determine. It was, however, sufficient to banish despair, encourage hope, and become the foundation of repentance, and confidence in the Divine mercy, through the intervention of the Divine Redeemer. These were the practical results intended by the Father of mercies, and it seems that they were accomplished in reference to our first parents; for it is highly probable that the first sacrifices were offered in Paradise, and pardon was bestowed upon the penitents ere they were expelled from the place. Immediately after the revelation of mercy, it is added, 'And Adam called his wife's name Heve (חוה, *that is*, LIFE); because she was the mother of all living.' The Septuagint has correctly rendered the passage, Καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδὰμ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ ΖΩΗ, ὅτι μήτηρ πάντων τῶν ζώντων —'And Adam called his wife's name Life; because she was the mother of all living.' The application of this name by Adam to his wife immediately after the solemn announcement of both the promise and the threatening of God, is marked with peculiar interest and significance; for it fully shows that Adam believed the promise of salvation, and expected *life* for himself, and *life* for his progeny, through the woman's seed. As an expression of his faith and hope, he called his wife's name 'LIFE;' the mother of all who live, both in a temporal and a spiritual sense (as the application is undefined); and the mother, also, of the Author, Preserver, and Giver of *Eternal* Life to mankind. In the very next verse, it is added, 'Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them:' that is, directed them in the use of them for clothing—another significant passage; for, as the former expresses Adam's faith in the promise of a Saviour, so this implies his offering sacrifice to God, through that faith. For whence the skins of animals, but from such as had been slain? and slain

they must have been as sacrificial victims, since no permission was given, as yet, to use them for food. If this view be correct, it will follow that their faith in the first promise was immediately followed by a further revelation, and with special directions for such worship as was acceptable to God, adapted to their state, calculated to strengthen their faith, and adumbrate the great sacrifice which, in the fulness of time, was to be offered by the promised Seed for the salvation of the world. What a relief, in reading this scroll of woe, to find it interspersed with promises of mercy, and recording such indications of the fallen pair embracing the promises, and obtaining reconciliation ere they were expelled from Paradise! How Jehovah magnified his grace!—how soon the tempter began to be defeated in his malignant designs!

The exclusion of Adam from Paradise makes nothing against the view we entertain of his restoration to Divine favour: for temporal punishment is quite compatible with a state of grace and salvation; and certainly the garden of Eden was no longer a fit abode for a fallen creature, though saved by grace. Nor does the placing of a flaming sword, or rather the active flame, a body of fire giving out flashes and brilliant coruscations, at the east of the garden, imply that man was not pardoned. It implies, we conceive, both judgment and mercy. Judgment, in keeping the way of the Tree of Life: denoting, that man had no longer access to it since he was become mortal; and that the way of life, by the old covenant, was no longer accessible. But mercy, by fixing there a visible symbol of the Divine presence, or Shekinah, where God was worshipped, and which was appropriately called '*The presence of the Lord.*' For the radiant flame, which turned every way, or which revolved upon itself, was like the cloudy, fiery pillar, which led the tribes of Israel through the wilderness, and like the glory which afterwards filled the temple. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel were probably offered before this celestial brightness; for when Cain was rejected, it is said that 'he departed from the *presence* of the Lord.'*

But though the dreadful penalty of sin was arrested and suspended by the economy of mercy, yet the consequences of

* See the author's work on 'The Shekinah; or the Manifestation of Jehovah under the several Dispensations.'

sin, and the displeasure of God against it, were strikingly manifested. Those consequences, as narrated in the passages before cited, may be comprised in the following summary:—

1. Though life was continued for a time, it was to be marked by sorrows and afflictions: the woman to be in subjection, and to have suffering and danger in travail; the man to be doomed to hard labour; the soil to be less productive in food, but more prolific in useless and noxious weeds; and both the man and his wife to experience multiplied disappointments and pain.

2. Temporal death, though suspended, was ultimately to be inflicted. Driven from the tree of life, the virtues of which were probably ordained to be the natural means of preserving the body in undecaying vigour, man was now subject to the wastings of disease, and the decay of age; and finally the sentence was to be executed, 'Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.'

3. A state of spiritual death was also experienced. The Holy Spirit, whose influences were infused when 'God breathed into man the breath of *lives*,' was withdrawn when man fell into apostasy; and then man became corrupt—a mere rational animal, devoid of spiritual light and life, devoid of holy affections and heavenly aspirations—a prey to guilt and remorse, and a victim to a legion of unholy passions and propensities. The fearful change experienced soon became apparent. Immediately we see alienation. When the voice of the Lord was heard by Adam and Heve in the garden, they departed from his presence: for that communion with God which once formed their chief happiness, they had lost the desire—a proof that love was gone. A tormenting, slavish fear took the place of supreme affection—they hid themselves, for they were afraid. Ignorance beclouded their understanding; else how could they think to conceal themselves and their guilt from the eye of an omniscient Being? They became selfish, the man endeavouring to extenuate his own guilt by throwing the blame upon his wife, and indirectly upon God himself, who gave her to him—'The woman whom *thou* gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.' In the absence of love to God, human nature becomes cruel, and sin first perverts God's choicest gifts to a curse, and then reproaches God himself for bestowing them. There

was a sense of shame engendered; yet a shame the offspring of guilt, of irregular desires and disordered passions, not of penitential sorrow. Sin had hardened the heart, as well as deceived and polluted it; for, until grace was given, there was no manifestation of contrite feeling, no disposition to return to obedience. They sought not God; and when summoned before him, expressed no sorrow for sin, uttered no ingenuous confession, and offered no prayer for mercy, and never would have done had God left them to themselves. What a contrast to the uprightness, the dignity, the purity, and happiness in which they were formed, when God pronounced them very good! The crown had fallen from their head, and the glory had departed from them.

4. Another effect of the fall was man's expulsion from Paradise. Eden was designed only as the abode of innocence, and when man rebelled, he broke the conditions on which he held this happy inheritance; and though Divine mercy provided for his redemption, and there is some evidence that the mercy was obtained, yet, seeing a variety of temporal evils had to be endured as a visible manifestation of God's displeasure against sin, it was necessary that man should be expelled from the inheritance he had forfeited by his apostasy. Besides, as his condition was altered, the circumstances of his probation and mode of moral discipline were altered too. This rendered his removal from Paradise necessary. And though this change was penal, it was, doubtless, one more appropriate to his character, and, through the provisions of grace, better adapted to his salvation; for it is the effect of grace to transform the curse into a blessing.

5. Eternal death was included in the original threatening, and to this curse man became exposed by his fall; and it must have been inflicted had not mercy interposed with a system of recovery. But the immediate execution of this penalty was suspended, and its final accomplishment was made contingent upon man's conduct under a new class of circumstances. This is the reason why eternal death is not mentioned amongst the evils now pronounced upon man. No evils were expressly pronounced but those which were positive, and actually inflicted. Pardon was now placed within man's reach, through the promised Saviour, and therefore the curse of eternal death, and

the blessing of eternal life, were both made contingent upon man's improvement or abuse of the favourable circumstances in which he was placed.

We have now to consider the consequences of the fall in reference to Adam's posterity. A subject this, on which various shades of opinion are held even by orthodox divines. To insert these opinions would involve the obligation of critically examining them—a task which our space would not admit, and which would not comport with our design. In our prescribed limits, our remarks must be rather didactic than controversial. We shall, however, endeavour to state distinctly our own views and the scriptural basis on which they are founded.

That the fall of Adam has entailed upon his posterity a train of evils, both temporal and spiritual, is plainly declared in Scripture, and demonstrated by facts with which daily experience and observation render us mournfully familiar. The position of Adam, as the author of ruin and misery to his posterity, is illustrated by the position of Christ as the Author of grace and salvation for the human race. Indeed, the Apostle expressly speaks of Adam in this respect as a figure or type of Christ—*τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος, a type of him who was to come.* —Rom. v. 14. In the innocence and perfection of his nature in his original state, and in his dominion over all creation, he might be regarded as a type of our Saviour; but, as appears from the context, the similitude here intended is the *position* in which each, as a public character, stood to the human family —Adam as the author of sin and misery, Christ as the procurer of grace and salvation; the former, as the primogenitor of mankind, having, by his transgression, entailed evils and curses upon all his progeny; the latter, as the Saviour of men, having, by his obedience and sufferings, procured grace and blessings to counteract those consequences.

The case is not that Adam's sin is imputed to us *as ours*, for this notion alike contradicts our personal identity, our moral consciousness, and the principles of the Divine government revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures; but the case is, that, from our relation to Adam, we are subject to natural and moral evils resulting from his apostasy. Such a consequence of the defection of our first parents is in accordance with the ordinary proceedings of the Divine government, which, though it never

makes one man accountable for the sins of another, yet permits the effects of one man's transgressions to involve suffering and woes upon others. Thus, the prodigal entails want and disgrace upon his offspring; thus, the licentious parent, the victim of intemperance and lust, not only vitiates his own constitution, but transmits disease and wretchedness to his progeny, who inherit the consequences of their parent's sins, without participating in his guilt. A wicked ruler sometimes plunges whole nations into misery, and the consequences are felt for generations. So a man, in violating the laws of his country, may involve his posterity in disgrace and civil penalties. If he commit treason, his estate is taken from him, and his children become disinherited. All such facts illustrate the connection betwixt our condition and Adam's transgression.

In reference to temporal evils, the case is so plain as to admit of no question with those who profess to acknowledge the authority of the Scriptures; and because they are the more obvious they claim our first attention.

1. *Temporal evils.* The curse pronounced upon the ground, causing a deterioration of its fertility and productive properties, the multiplication of useless and noxious weeds, and the consequent subjection of man to excessive toil, disappointment, and anxiety, is everywhere seen to this day. It is the inheritance of each generation, and the Scriptures plainly refer it to the original transgression: 'Cursed is the ground for thy sake, in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground.' The pain, travail, and danger of conception and child-bearing are universally experienced, and, in a passage already quoted, are described as the hereditary fruits of the woman's transgression.—Gen. iii. 16.

2. *The dissolution of the body* is another part of the hereditary curse. That death is not the result of man's original constitution and condition, but a part of the penalty of sin, we have already seen. The universality of death, then, is a fact which shows that the penalty is transmitted, and is co-extensive with the human race. Infants die as well as adults; those who have never actually sinned, as well as those

who are guilty of multiplied transgressions—a clear proof that death, as a penalty, waits not for personal and voluntary sin, but proceeds from the original offence, and belongs to our condition as the degenerate offspring of a fallen progenitor. Thus, in the Book of Wisdom: 'For God created man incorruptible, and in the image of his own likeness he made him; but by the envy of the devil, death came into the world.' The Apostle Paul expressly affirms that death is the hereditary consequence of Adam's transgression: 'For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.'—1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. 'By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.' 'Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.' —Rom. v. 12, 18. These visible effects of sin are awful proofs of its malignity, and terrible manifestations of God's displeasure against it.

3. *The depravity of our moral nature* is another result of the fall. The fact that all men sin against God is asserted in the plainest language of Scripture; and while this fact *argues* a vitiated nature, the Bible *declares* it. Cain, the first offspring of Adam, was a murderer; and Abel, his brother, offered sacrifice to avert the Divine displeasure, by which he confessed that he was a sinner. When the human species had greatly multiplied, the tide of depravity rose in proportion, until the earth was filled with violence, and all flesh had corrupted its way. In the age of the Patriarchs, the description of man is, that he is 'abominable and filthy,' and 'drinketh iniquity like water.'— Job xv. 16. The Psalmist says, that 'the Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one.'—Ps. xiv. 2, 3. The wise man declares, 'There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not.'—Eccles. vii. 20. Nor does this description apply merely to heathens and idolaters, but to all men. Isaiah confesses for himself and the whole of our race, 'All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us

all'—liii. 6. And when the Apostle Paul is speaking of the state of man as a sinner, he takes care to prevent the supposition that his description applies to the Gentiles only, by showing that the Jews were involved in the same guilt and condemnation. 'What then? are we (Jews) better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.'—Rom. iii. 9—19.

4. The history of our race, as furnished by profane writers, corresponds with this awful delineation, for it is little else but a continuous record of the licentious workings of human depravity—of lust, pride, malice, selfishness, and contempt of God. Everywhere we see mankind alienated from their Maker. Everywhere we see the prince of darkness usurping the throne of the Most High, and mankind prostrate before him. Everywhere (except where Revelation shines, and the dispensation of grace prevails) we see God either totally forgotten, or his pure and simple homage distorted into monstrous forms of demon and idol worship, changing the world into an immense pantheon, crowded with hideous deities, the patrons of every vice, and the examples of every crime. The licentious rites of Venus; the drunken orgies of Bacchus; the cruel immolations of Moloch; and the torrents of suicidal blood annually poured to gorge the idol Juggernaut—are the oblations substituted for the holy incense of gratitude, love, and obedience to the true God. But sin has not only separated man from his Maker; it has alienated man from his brother. It has generated hatred, malice, and strife; it is the parent of cruelty, oppression, and blood. It early showed its tendency in the

murder of righteous Abel, and it has left the print of its bloody footsteps on every age. It has made selfishness the predominant passion amongst men, and converted religion into a crime. It has forged chains for the captive, and fetters for the slave, until the iron hath entered their soul. It has constructed dungeons for the patriot, scaffolds for the brave, and lighted up the martyr's fire. It has constituted the demon of war the most popular deity, made his service one of the highest virtues, and presented to him the holocaust of millions. It has desolated cities, depopulated empires, and changed the earth from a paradise into an aceldama—a field of carnage and blood; and had not grace prevented, would have changed it into hell itself.

That there are instances recorded of apparent virtues and excellencies among men, even in the heathen world, we acknowledge; but that these are exceptions to the delineation given of the ruined and degenerate state of man, we cannot admit. For many of the so-called virtues are but vices in disguise; as, when courage, patriotism, continence, and beneficence spring from pride, ambition, selfishness, or other corrupt motives. Generally, indeed, these apparent excellencies are associated with other qualities, which evidently prove the question before us, and convict the heart as corrupt before God. The chastity of Lucretia was connected with the sin of suicide; the fidelity of Regulus, with implacable enmity to Carthage; the temperance of Cato, with envy, parsimony, and cruelty; the generosity of Fabricius, with military ambition; and the wisdom and virtue of Socrates ended in an act of idolatry. Besides, the existence of real virtues and actions truly good among the heathens, may be admitted without at all affecting the doctrine of general depravity; for though all men are sinners, all men are favoured with a measure of the Holy Spirit; and that his gracious influence should so far operate, and so far be yielded to, as to produce some holy fruit, is only what we might rationally expect, even amongst men in the heathen world. These, however, are the effects of grace, not of nature. But to make out a single exception against the depravity of mankind, a case of original, spontaneous, uniform holiness must be produced—the case of a man's life without sin must be shown. But of such a case there is no record, much less decisive proof. The

history of man, so far as it is given, both at home and abroad, in ancient and modern times, is one which illustrates and confirms the Divine record—that 'there is none that doeth good, no, not one.' There is one incontestable proof of human depravity, of which the experience of every man renders him conscious—namely, a disinclination to submit to God; a repugnance to his authority, and even an unwillingness to be saved on God's own terms.

5. This universal wickedness of life, so plainly asserted by Scripture and proved by fact, rationally argues a corrupt nature. If the tree is known by its fruits, and the cause can be determined by its effects, it will follow that universal depravity of manners is a rational demonstration of universal depravity of heart. For evil actions flow from evil motives, and evil motives spring from corrupt affections, and corrupt affections and principles imply a radical defection and depravity in our moral constitution. If there were no corruption of our nature, or if men were as much inclined to virtue as to vice, to holiness as to sin, there would undoubtedly be some examples of spontaneous holiness and obedience to God. But the Scripture speaks of *all* as guilty before God, that is, chargeable with personal transgression; and declares that all have gone out of the way; and all authentic histories of our world, as furnished by profane writers, present a faithful correspondence with the portrait drawn by the pen of inspiration. With the fact, then, of universal wickedness before us, we can draw no other rational inference than that it is *natural*—that there is a moral *virus* within us from which it springs.

This was the prevailing sentiment among heathen writers, and if this sentiment be the deduction of reason, it corroborates our argument; or if a truth transmitted by tradition, it shows that the tradition harmonized with the experience and the common sense of mankind. Plato speaks of our '*natural wickedness.*' Pythagoras refers to 'the fatal companion, the noxious strife, that lurks within us, and was born along with us.' Socrates acknowledged that he was naturally prone to the grossest vices. Seneca says, 'We are born in such a condition that we are not subject to fewer disorders of the mind than of the body;' that 'all vices are in all men, though they do not break out in every one;' and that 'to confess them is the beginning of our

cure.' Cicero lamented that 'men are brought into life by nature as a stepmother; with a naked, frail, and infirm body, and a soul *prone to divers lusts*.' Propertius said that 'everybody has a vice to which he is inclined by nature.' Horace declared that 'no man is born free from vices,' and that 'he is the best who is oppressed with the least;' that 'mankind rush into wickedness, and always desire what is forbidden;' that 'youth has the softness of wax to receive vicious impressions, and the hardness of a rock to resist virtuous admonitions.' Juvenal, as if he had understood what St Paul says of the 'carnal mind,' affirms that 'nature, unchangeably fixed, tends, yea, runs back to wickedness, as bodies to their centre.'* These writers were men of extensive observation, and were deeply versed in the knowledge of human nature. We refer to them, however, not as authorities, but as the testimonies of men who uttered the voice of reason and experience on this important question.

But what saith the Scriptures? Their decision establishes the sentiment already expressed, and therefore gives it the weight of Divine authority. The iniquity of the life is everywhere ascribed to the morbid state of the heart. 'The heart,' says Jeremiah, 'is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?'—Jer. xvii. 9. 'Out of the heart,' says the Saviour, 'proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies; these are the things which defile a man.'—Matt. xv. 19, 20. When God gave the description of the finished impiety which characterized the world before the Deluge, the whole degeneracy is ascribed to the *heart* as its prolific source; for he says, 'The imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually—evil from his youth.'—Gen. vi. 5; viii. 21. No language can more forcibly express the fact that a tendency to evil is a part of man's moral constitution—it is in his heart; in the imagination of his heart; in the imagination of the thoughts of his heart. It is intertwined in the fibres of his heart, and blends itself with all the operations and emotions of his soul.

6. What is thus a part of man's moral constitution from his youth, must be *natural and hereditary*, and such the Scriptures declare our depravity to be. The Psalmist says, 'Behold,

* Vide Fletcher's Appeal.

I was shapen in iniquity ; and in sin did my mother conceive me.'—Ps. li. 5. Job speaks of man as born 'like a wild ass's colt'—fierce and untractable ; and he asks, 'What is man, that he should be clean ? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous ? ' Such language could have no consistency or propriety if man were not born in a degenerate state. St Paul expressly refers the sinfulness of man to the original offence ; he says, 'By one man's disobedience many were made sinners'—born with a sinful nature, with propensities which lead men to voluntary and practical transgression. The various names applied to our depraved condition imply that it is natural and hereditary. It is called emphatically 'SIN : ' sin, so full of activity and energy, that it is the life and spring of all others. 'Indwelling SIN '—sin which is not like the leaves and fruit of a bad tree, that appear for a time and then drop off ; but like the sap that dwells and works within, always ready to break out at every bud. 'The body of sin,' because it is an assemblage of all possible sins in embryo, as our body is an assemblage of all the members which constitute the human frame. 'The *law of sin*' and 'the *law* in our members,' because it hath a constraining force, and rules in our mortal bodies, as a mighty tyrant in the kingdom which he hath usurped. 'The *old man*,' because we have it from the first Adam, and because it is as old as the first stamina of our frame, and closely interwoven therewith. 'The *flesh*,' as being propagated by carnal generation, and always opposing the Spirit, the gracious principle which we have from the second Adam ; and '*concupiscence*,' that mystical Jezebel, who brings forth the infinite variety of 'fleshly, worldly, and mental lusts which war against the soul.' * He who lives under its influence is called '*the natural man*,' and as such he receiveth not the things of God, they are foolishness unto him. It is the '*carnal mind*,' and its chief feature is *enmity* against God, and insubordination to his will.

7. That our depravity is hereditary, is implied by the fact of our Lord's miraculous conception—an interposition required to secure the immaculate purity of the Redeemer—that, while he took upon him our nature, he might be free from its moral pollution, and offer himself to God as 'the Lamb without spot or blemish.' The same truth is implied in the numerous repre-

* Fletcher's Appeal.

sentations given of the great change necessary, in order to prepare the soul for heaven—a change, requiring not only the renunciation of evil habits, but a change in the state of the heart. It is called regeneration, or the *new birth*, because, as in our natural birth we are corrupt, the change necessary is as great as if we were born again under new circumstances. It is called a new creation. 'If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature' (καινὴ κτίσις), a new creation—'old things are passed away, and all things are become new.' It is described by our having a 'new heart and a new spirit'—by God's taking away our heart of stone, 'and giving us a heart of flesh'—by our being renewed in the spirit of our mind. This work is everywhere described as the work of God, produced by his Holy Spirit; as a work which none but God can perform; and as a work which affords an exhibition of the exceeding greatness of his power. All these representations plainly imply that our depravity is *innate*, that the tendency to sin is in the very constitution of our nature.

What, then, is the sum of the evidence before us? It is —First, that all men, without exception, sin against God. Secondly, that this sin is not the result of example merely, but is referred to the heart or soul. Thirdly, that this vitiated state of the soul is natural and inbred. Fourthly, that this depravity, being natural, is hereditary, and is referred to Adam's apostasy as its origin: thus, 'by one man's disobedience many were made sinners.' The nature in which we are born is, then, that which Adam's became when he had fallen from God; and a comparison of our state with his, when minutely examined (so far as the brevity of the account presents *data* for examination and comparison), shows this resemblance in a wonderful manner. We thus see the meaning of the inspired writer, when he tells us, that, 'Adam begat a son in his own likeness'—not in the likeness of God, in which Adam was created; but in his *own likeness*, depraved and sinful in his nature; and in this state all his progeny have descended from him. Thus, the Scriptures account for the fact, too obvious to be denied—the general depravity of our race. The universal wickedness of man is as obvious as the universal mortality of man, the universal pains of child-bearing, and the curse that rests upon the soil. All these are declared the effects of sin, and it is the same Divine testimony which accounts for one as for the other.

As a consequence of our depraved nature, we are disinherited from the favour of God and everlasting blessedness. We have naturally neither title nor qualification for the one nor for the other. But we are not left in this state, and no man is permitted to perish solely on account of his corrupt nature. Had not the system of redemption been interposed, it is morally certain that God would have prevented the propagation of the human species; and the consequences of the fall would have been thus confined to our guilty progenitors.

The provisions of mercy to deliver us from the evils of our fallen nature, and of personal transgression, are thus stated by the Apostle Paul: 'But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore as by the offence of one *judgment* came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the *free gift* came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' 'Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.' 'The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.'—Rom. v. 15—19, 20, 21; vi. 23. These passages teach and imply the following important truths:—

1. By one man, Adam, all men are involved in sin and ruin: by One—namely, Christ—who took upon him human nature, all men are placed in a state of grace and salvation.

2. Through the first Adam the body is subject to mortality; but through the Second we shall all be raised from the dead.

3. Through the first Adam our nature is depraved and corrupt: through Christ, the grace of the Holy Spirit is given to renew and sanctify our nature.

4. Through the sin of Adam we have lost our natural title

to everlasting blessedness: through Christ our title is restored —'the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.'

5. Through actual transgression, the practical effects of our fallen nature, we are exposed to everlasting punishment—the second death; but through Christ pardon is procured—justification from many offences.

In reference to those who die in infancy, their eternal happiness is secured in an absolute mode—the atonement of Christ procuring them a title to heaven, and the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit renewing their nature, and giving them a qualification for the joys of God's presence.

In reference to those who live to riper years, they are favoured with the influences of the Holy Spirit, the means of grace, and the offers of mercy; and have thus the opportunity of being renewed in their nature, of obtaining the justification of their persons, of receiving all the blessings of the covenant, and, finally, everlasting life.

In reference to the heathen, they are blest with the light of the Holy Spirit, and will be judged righteously according to the circumstances in which they are placed.

Those who refuse the mercy offered through Christ become guilty of trampling on the blood of the everlasting covenant, and despising the riches of Divine grace; and their condemnation will be awfully aggravated by the greatness of that mercy they reject. Perseverance in sin, after we know the remedy of the Gospel, involves not only the guilt of rejecting God, but implies a consent to the motions of our depravity, and a desire to continue in subjection to its influence. This is a voluntary approval of our depraved state, and such an approval brings us under guilt. To approve of sin in others is equivalent to committing it ourselves; and to cherish and indulge our depraved nature, and reject the remedy which grace has provided, are much the same as if we had voluntarily vitiated and corrupted our own nature. Reader, what is thy state? If yet unsaved, hasten to the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ATONEMENT.

N every department of practical or theoretic philosophy, there re some acknowledged axioms which constitute the basis of ie respective systems: so in the Gospel plan of redemption, iere are certain fundamental truths on which the whole fabric ' Christianity is based; and those truths are embodied in the reat doctrine of Christ crucified for sinners, or the death of hrist an atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world. Every her Divine truth is so vitally connected with this doc- ine, that to deny it would be in effect to deny the whole hristian system. It would be not merely a defacing of me ornamental part of the structure, but a sapping and de- oying of the foundation. Such being the importance of the ctrine, it is our solemn duty, as well as our inestimable privi- ge, to have clear and scriptural views respecting it. These ews are to be obtained by a candid and careful examination God's holy Word.

The word 'atonement' is pure English, and literally sig- ies to be *at one;* and, as used in theology, it is applied to it grand procuring cause by which God and man become *one* by which man is restored to a state of friendly relationship h his offended Maker. This is declared to be through the ith of our Lord Jesus Christ. Indeed, all that is meant by 'atonement' is most clearly and forcibly expressed by the ostle Paul:—'Being justified freely by his grace through redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set h to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through forbearance of God.' To give due prominence and empha- to this important doctrine, the Apostle repeats the state- it: 'To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that night be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in is.'—Rom. iii. 24—26. Human language cannot express doctrine more plainly than the atonement is expressed his passage, and therefore we shall give it our especial

consideration. Man is a sinner, condemned by the Divine law, and incapable of saving himself. God has provided a remedy for him, and here it is revealed. His grace is bestowed in our pardon through Jesus as our Redeemer. The passage shows how Christ is the Redeemer of man—namely, by dying for him.

1. The Apostle clearly teaches that there is a distinct character and object assigned to the Redeemer's death, or the Redeemer's 'blood.' That character is '*a propitiation*' (ἱλαστήριον, *hilasterion*)—a propitiatory sacrifice. To whom is the propitiation offered? To GOD, whose law man has broken. What is the object for which this sacrifice is presented? That man may be pardoned—that he may '*receive the remission of sins that are past.*' But why must pardon be granted in this mode, and this mode alone? Because the moral perfections of the Deity, his justice and his righteousness, require it—'*that God might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.*' Thus the Apostle teaches that, in order that the justice of God and the sinner's pardon might be rendered compatible, a propitiation was required; in order that the righteousness of God and the remission of sins might be harmonized together, a propitiation was required; and that propitiation is the precious blood of Christ. Now, this implies clearly the following negative proposition: namely, that *without* this propitiatory sacrifice God's justice and the sinner's pardon could *not* be harmonized; without it God's righteousness and the forgiveness of sin could *not* be reconciled. It implies that pardon, without this propitiation, would involve a compromise of the character of God; and therefore, the justice or righteousness of God, placed an eternal barrier to the sinner's pardon, without a propitiation. A propitiation there *must* be; and this propitiation is declared to be the blood of Christ.

Thus the Apostle teaches, in language too plain and direct to be misunderstood, that the doctrine of atonement has its foundation in the perfections of the Deity, and the unchangeable principles of his moral government. God is not only the Father of men—he is also the Sovereign of the universe. He is not only boundless in love, but he is absolutely pure and holy; and holiness in God is not merely the absence of sin, it is *aversion* to sin. As the supreme Governor of the universe,

is justice required, and as a holy and righteous God his nature emanded, that sin should not be pardoned without a propitiaon, or atonement, being made for man. This is the doctrine aught by the Apostle in this passage. For God to pardon ne rebel, and receive him into his favour, without an atonement, ould be incompatible with the claims of justice, and subverve of the ends of the Divine government; it would annul the uthority of the law which man had broken; would interfere ith the rectitude and stability of the Divine government; ould throw down the guards of moral order in the universe; nd weaken or destroy the most powerful motives to obedience, confidence, reverence, and holiness. Therefore a propitiaon was required, and it was presented in the sacrifice of hrist.

The word rendered 'propitiation' in this passage is ἱλαστήριον (*hilasterion*), and it has been alleged that this word sometimes means 'mercy-seat.' We grant that it is sometimes applied the mercy-seat, but in a *secondary* sense, and always in a *condary* sense; for there is nothing in the Greek word rendered 'propitiation' which radically contains any semblance to e idea of the covering of the ark, or of a seat or a throne. The reek work is derived from ἱλασκω (*hilasko*), to *propitiate*, to *ocure favour*, to *atone*, to *appease*, to *reconcile* by *sacrifice*. his is the primary meaning of the term; and therefore, as a un, it means one who propitiates or turns aside displeasure: an adjective, it has the word θύμα (*thuma*), or sacrifice, unrstood. When applied to the mercy-seat, it has the word ιθήμα (*epithema*) understood, and literally means the propitory covering. But as applied to Christ, its signification presses the radical meaning of the term—to propitiate, to ocure favour by sacrifice. And it ought to be remarked that, the word did mean 'mercy-seat,' that term, from its essential nnection with the propitiatory sacrifice, would express the use we have now given; for the atoning blood was sprinkled the covering of the ark of the covenant, and the sprinkled od of the slaughtered victim rendered that the mercy-seat. thout the blood being shed the mercy-seat itself would e been the throne of judgment, and not of mercy; and the d glory of the Shekinah resting thereon would have become consuming fire' to the bold intruder who ventured there

without blood. It was the blood which did propitiate; and the precious blood, shed in our behalf, is the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Every theory, therefore, which sets aside the atonement (the proper propitiatory sacrifice of Christ) is contradictory to the plain testimony of the Apostle. To maintain that God forgives sin in the exercise of his mere clemency, is to contradict the Apostle; for his language most clearly shows that the claims of justice are as much respected as the dictates of mercy in the sinner's pardon; and to accomplish this, a propitiation is made in the sinner's behalf by the death of Christ; and that through this propitiation the righteousness or justice of God is declared and exhibited, as well as his clemency.

Again:—To maintain that the sinner's *repentance* satisfies and honours Divine justice, and thus makes atonement, is equally to contradict the Apostle, by transferring the act of atonement from Christ to the rebel himself, and to assign that efficacy to the sinner's tears which St Paul assigns expressly and solely to the Saviour's blood. It is not any act of man that propitiates or atones, but the sacrificial death of our Lord, and through him alone God can be just, strictly righteous, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. This is the doctrine of St Paul.

Seeing the death of our blessed Lord as the cause of our salvation is so explicitly set forth by the Apostle in this passage and in numerous other parts of Scripture, some have endeavoured to destroy its force by maintaining that we are saved through Christ *indirectly*—by the moral influence which his benevolent and self-denying example exerts upon our hearts, in subduing *our* hostility, and reconciling *us* to God. But this is irrelevant, and evades the proper question before us: for the Apostle is not referring to any means by which *man's* hostility towards God may be subdued, but expressly and solely to the mode by which God's mercy can be exercised towards repenting man, without a compromise of his character as a just God and a righteous governor; and this is plainly declared to be the propitiation of the Saviour's death. The Apostle is certainly not speaking in this passage of Christ as a *martyr*, but as a *sacrifice*—not as an *example*, but as a *Saviour;* and the only influence or efficacy he here assigns to his death is that of pro-

itiation; and as this propitiation is not offered to the sinner to ppease *him*, there is no allusion to any influence it has upon ne affections. As stated by the Apostle, the efficacy acts *di-ectly* upon the Divine perfections and the Divine administra-on—'the propitiation is set forth to declare God's righteous-ess—that He might be just, and the justifier of him that elieveth in Jesus.'

Moreover, the subjugation of man's hostility to God is the ffect of regeneration, and regeneration is the appropriate work f the Holy Ghost; for when a man is born again, he is 'born f the Spirit;' when he is sanctified, he is sanctified by the pirit—'by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of ne Holy Ghost.' It is true that the scriptural records of hrist's love in our redemption, are designed to affect our hearts -to exert an influence upon our affections; but they do it only strumentally—the efficient agent in applying any portion of ivine truth is the Holy Ghost. It is true the Apostle speaks ' 'the love of Christ constraining us;' but, then, it is when at 'love is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost given nto us.' While the reasoning, therefore, of our opponents is relevant, it involves the absurdity of confounding sanctification ith justification, and the work of the Spirit in renewing the art with the work of Christ in satisfying the claims of justice, d honouring Jehovah's righteous law.

Once more: the notion that the death of Christ saves men ly by the moral influence it exerts upon their hearts, is con-dicted by the fact that multitudes are saved *by* Christ, or rough his death, who never heard his name, and who, there-e, could not be impressed or converted by an acquaintance th his history. For example: many heathens, we may charita- hope, are saved, and if saved, are saved through Christ, and rough him alone; for 'no man cometh unto the Father but him.' Now, if heathens are saved through Christ alone, as e Scriptures declare, they must be saved through the atone-nt he has made for them, and not by their contemplation of Saviour's benevolent example. Patriarchs, prophets, and y men, who lived ages before Christ was incarnate, were saved him, but certainly not indirectly by a moral influence, result-from a contemplation of his history. If, then, those were ed by Christ, it must have been by virtue of the atonement

he had undertaken to accomplish, and which was efficacious to human salvation from the first moment of the promise by which he engaged to be our Saviour, for he is 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.'

2. The salvation of those who die in infancy is a further illustration of this subject. Infant children are doubtless subject to various evils resulting from the fall. Though the sin of Adam be not imputed to them as their personal transgression, yet their condition is deeply affected by his apostasy. Through that apostasy they are depraved and rendered liable to temporal death, and, as the progeny of guilty parents, they have naturally no claim to the Divine favour and everlasting life. Yet, all who die in infancy are saved eternally. On departing this life, their spirits are admitted to heaven, and hereafter their bodies too shall be raised to glory and immortality. 'Of such,' says the Saviour, 'is the kingdom of heaven;' for, 'their angels do always behold the face of my Father in heaven.' Now, this grace is conferred upon them *through* Christ, and through him *alone*—for, 'though the wages of sin is death, the gift of God is eternal life *through our Lord Jesus Christ.*' But we would ask, how can the salvation and eternal happiness of infants be *through* our Lord Jesus Christ, if his death had no efficacy affecting the moral administration of God? If his death exert only a *moral* influence upon the human heart, we demand, how can infants be saved *through a Saviour's death?* How can the gift of eternal life to infants be said to be *through* our Lord Jesus Christ, if he has not procured this gift for them by his death? Infants never heard of the Saviour—never knew of the Saviour. The tender displays of his compassion and love can exert no practical influence on their minds. His teachings, his example, and sufferings, were never contemplated by them, and can, therefore, effect no change in their hearts; for, in this world they never knew that Christ existed. Yet they are said to be saved *through* Christ, and through him alone. How, we ask, can they be saved *through* Christ at all, if his death only saves souls by exerting a moral influence upon them? The fact is this—they all *are* saved through Christ; there is no passage to heaven but *through* Christ; the whole volume of Scripture declares this doctrine; and if children are *not* saved through the moral influence of a Saviour's death, they *must* be

aved by virtue of an *expiatory* influence or efficacy in his death, procuring for them the blessing of everlasting life. And if the leath of Christ *procures* for infants everlasting glory and a oyful resurrection, it *procures* the same blessings for all men. And if it procure these blessings, it must procure all other lessings; and if it procure for us these blessings, there must e an efficacy in it, not merely to affect the human heart, but n efficacy affecting the moral administration of the Deity, and resenting such reasons as render it just and righteous with God, to open the kingdom of heaven to our spirits, and admit s to everlasting bliss.

Now this is the efficacy the Apostle expressly assigns to the Redeemer's death, and which appears conspicuous in every part f the sacred volume. Without his propitiatory sacrifice there ould be no salvation; but through his atoning death all men re placed in a salvable state.

3. The history of God's moral government, so far as it has een made known to man, coincides with this doctrine, and resents further illustration of its truth. Besides ourselves, here is another class of sinful and unhappy beings, whose con- ition is made known to us. There are fallen angels as well as llen men. Now, for fallen men there is pardon, because there s a propitiation. God can be just, and justify ungodly *men*, ecause there is a propitiation. But for fallen angels there is o atonement, and, therefore, no pardon; for they are said to e 'reserved in chains under darkness unto the judgment of ne great day.'—Jude 6. 'For verily he took not on him the ature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto is brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High riest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for ne sins of the people.' Thus, it appears that the death of our aviour was a vicarious offering—a real atonement for the sins f mankind; for the sins of those whose nature he bore, and, herefore, for all the human race.

4. All the representations given in the Scriptures respect- g the design of the Redeemer's death, furnish additional evi- ence and illustration of this important truth. The connection xisting between the institutions of the Jewish law and the bject of the Saviour's death, presents a vast body of evidence

in explanation and confirmation of the substitutionary and propitiatory character of the Redeemer's sacrifice. This connection we shall now examine.

That sacrificial institutions had a *Divine* origin, is too evident to require any elaborate argument. In them we see a mode of worship which neither the reason, the inclination, nor the interests of man could suggest; and yet we find that mode of worship coeval with the first revelation of mercy. Though, for obvious reasons, sacrifices had no place in man's worship while he retained his innocence, yet we find them used in his first approaches to God when involved in guilt and condemnation. The skins which clothed our first parents were doubtless the skins of animals which had been offered as sacrificial victims, ere our guilty yet penitent progenitors were excluded from Eden; and the presentation of sacrificial victims at this period, viewed in connection with the promise of a Saviour, shows that both the offering and the promise had a common origin. In the next chapter we find righteous Abel offering '*by faith*' the firstlings of his flock, and we see the testimony of Heaven's approval of his oblation. At that period man had not received authority to slaughter animals for food; yet he slaughters them for sacrifice, and finds acceptance through them, for they were an expression of his faith. But if Abel's offering was an expression of his faith, it implies the fact that he knew he was acting in accordance with some Divine requirement; and the visible approval of Heaven establishes this conclusion. Subsequently we find this mode of worship expressly ordained by Divine injunction, and all the accompanying rites were prescribed by the same authority, amid sublime and awful manifestations of Jehovah's majesty. The same authority which ordained the Jewish ritual, and guarded and enforced it by the most solemn sanctions, shows its typical connection with the Redeeming character and work of Christ. Hence it is declared that 'the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.' Paul says that the 'law had a shadow of good things to come.' A shadow implies a substance, and that substance was the Redeemer of mankind; 'for Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.' There is an essential connection between the law and the Gospel. What, in fact, is the New Testament economy, but the expan-

sion and bright development of great principles which were partially or obscurely discovered in the preceding economy? It is the same stream of mercy, though widened and deepened in its course;—the beams of the same Sun of Righteousness, though risen from grey dawn to noon-day brightness.

Just as the ceremonial law had a reference to the Gospel, the victims offered under the law had a reference to Christ. The former, indeed, had no object in their appointment but as they referred to Christ—no spiritual efficacy in their use but as they stood connected with his death. They were types; he is the glorious Antitype. They were figures for the time then present; he is the Truth; and in him is fully realized and accomplished all that they adumbrated and predicted. This connection is so intimate that the very names of the former are transferred to the latter, and the same object is assigned to both. As the Old Testament was written in the Hebrew language, and the New Testament in the Greek, we cannot, indeed, have Hebrew terms introduced into the Greek Testament; but it has pleased Providence that we should have a medium, by which we can most accurately determine what is the meaning of the Hebrew terms; for as an historical fact, we know that about 287 years prior to the coming of our Lord the Hebrew text was translated into Greek, which translation is called the Septuagint; and this version has come down to our times. Therefore, we can easily ascertain what sense the Jews, who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, have assigned to the terms in Hebrew; and thus we can compare the terms in the Septuagint with the terms employed in the New Testament.

In the New Testament, Christ is called *θυσία*, a slaughtered victim; *ἁμαρτία*, a sin-offering; *ἱλασμός*, a propitiatory sacrifice; *ἱλαστήριον*, a propitiatory, or mercy-seat; *προσφορὰ*, an oblation; *ἀπολύτρωσις*, our redemption; *λύτρον*, a ransom; and *ἀντίλυτρον*, our redemption price. Now, in the Septuagint, these are the very terms applied to the sacrificial victims under the law. Of course, the application of these terms to Christ is, in the highest sense, proper; for they are applied to him by the Spirit of Truth; and while they mark Christ's connection with the Levitical institution, they clearly evince the atoning object of his death.

The connection between the Jewish sacrifices and the Redeemer being thus established, it will follow that a more minute examination into the nature and objects of the one will more clearly and fully illustrate the other. We have here an infallible principle to guide us—a principle laid down by the Spirit of God; and we have only to follow faithfully its teachings, and we shall be guided effectually and safely into all truth.

The word most frequently employed by theologians to express the design of the Redeemer's death is the word '*Atonement.*' This word is extensively used in our version of the Old Testament, and a careful inquiry into the use of the original word, both as a verb and a noun, will show the force and propriety of its application to the Saviour's sacrifice.

First. *As a verb.*—In the Old Testament the Hebrew word '*to atone*' is כפר, *kaphar*. It is translated in the Septuagint by the word ἱλασκω, *hilasko*, or ἐξιλασκω, a word of the same meaning. Now, we have the very same term employed in the New Testament to denote the object of our Redeemer's death. But we shall first give a few familiar instances, which will render the general reader familiar with the meaning of the words employed. We observe, then, the word כפר, *kaphar*, as a Hebrew verb, signifies *to atone, to appease, to pacify, to procure favour.* Take a few examples:—Gen. xxxii. 20: Jacob had incurred the displeasure of his brother Esau, and is afraid to meet him. He sends a present to him, and assigns his motive for doing so; for Jacob says, 'I will *appease* him with the present that goeth before me, and afterward I will see his face; peradventure he will accept of me.' Here the word כפר, *kaphar*, is rendered to *appease;* and in the Greek it is ἐξιλασκω, *to appease, propitiate, procure favour.*

Take another example. In Prov. xvi. 14 it is said, 'The wrath of a king is as messengers of death: but a wise man will *pacify* it.' Here the word כפר, *kaphar*, is rendered to *pacify*, to turn aside displeasure. And in the Septuagint it is again ἐξιλασκω.

Take another example. In the 16th chapter of Ezekiel, and 63rd verse, it is written—'That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more, because of thy shame, when I am *pacified* toward thee for all

that thou hast done, saith the Lord God.' Here the same Hebrew word is again rendered '*pacified*'—that is, displeasure removed or turned away; and the Septuagint employs the same word as before.

Now, let us look at this same word (כפר) employed in a *ceremonial* sense. In Numbers xvi. we find that the people of Israel had murmured against God—had incurred his righteous displeasure—and the plague had broken out amongst them; but Moses commanded Aaron to put on incense, to make *atonement* for the people. 'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Get you up from among this congregation, that I may consume them as in a moment. And they fell upon their faces. And Moses said unto Aaron, Take a censer, and put fire therein from off the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly unto the congregation, and make an atonement for them: for there is wrath gone out from the Lord; the plague is begun. And Aaron took as Moses commanded, and ran into the midst of the congregation; and, behold, the plague was begun among the people: and he put on incense, and made an *atonement* (כפר) for the people. And he stood between the dead and the living; and the plague was stayed.' Look at the condition of the people. They were perishing under Divine displeasure. Aaron puts on incense to make atonement, and the plague is stayed. Now, here the Hebrew word כפר, *kaphar*, to atone, is ἐξιλασκω in the Greek version, and we find that *very same term* employed in the New Testament with regard to the object of the Redeemer's death. Hence, in Heb. ii. 17, it is said—'That he (Christ) might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation (ἱλασκεσθαι, *hilaskesthai*) for the sins of the people.' In not less than eighty-nine instances is the word כפר, *kaphar*, employed in this sense in the Old Testament; and its correspondent term in the New Testament, from the Septuagint, or agreeing with the Septuagint, is ἱλασκω, *hilasko*. The case of the perishing Israelites, and the means of their deliverance, present a striking similitude to the state of mankind by sin, and their redemption by Jesus Christ. We have offended God; we are subject to his displeasure; we are liable to eternal death; but our great High Priest has put on incense—has offered his precious life as a sweet-smelling savour, to turn aside the shafts of justice, and

to procure for guilty rebels the blessings of pardon and everlasting life. Thus, both the import of the word employed and its ceremonial application characterize the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ. Such is the meaning of the word as a *verb;* but we have to inquire,

Secondly, *what is the application of the word as a noun?* The Hebrew word, as a noun, is כֹּפֶר, *kopher*, rendered *atonement;* and in the Greek of the Septuagint it is rendered ἱλασμος, and ἐξιλασμος, *atonement.* This same word, as a noun, is transferred to the New Testament, and applied to our blessed Saviour in reference to his sacrificial death. Take the following passage in 1 John ii. 1, 2:—'And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the *propitiation* (ἱλασμος) for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.' Also, in the 4th chap. and 10th verse—'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation (ἱλασμος, *hilasmos*) for our sins.'

It has been remarked by some that the word *atonement* never occurs in the New Testament except once, when the original is καταλλαγὴ, *katallage;* and that there it ought to be, and in the margin is, rendered *reconciliation.* Admit that καταλλαγὴ should be here rendered reconciliation, and what follows? That the word atonement is not contained in the New Testament? No such thing. The passages quoted in the preceding paragraph plainly show that it *is* contained in the New Testament, but concealed under the veil of our English translation. We have proved that, in the Septuagint, the word atonement is ἱλασμος, *hilasmos;* and the same word, when transferred to the New Testament, but applied to our Saviour, must have the *same* meaning. Now, in the passages quoted from 1 John ii. 1, 2, and iv. 10, Christ is especially called the ἱλασμος—'THE ATONEMENT FOR THE SINS OF THE WORLD.' Thus, both the doctrine and the phraseology are clearly taught in the Holy Scriptures. This shows the true sense to be put upon the word καταλλαγὴ. Reconciliation is the *effect* of which the great atonement is the procuring *Cause;* for it is the reconciliation, not of man to God, but of God to man. It is the appeasement accomplished by the great sacrifice of the Son of God. Hence the Apostle speaks of man *receiving* it—'By whom we have received the

καταλλαγὴ.' It is a boon of which man is the recipient, and that through our Lord Jesus Christ.

In the several kinds of victims presented in sacrifice, and the solemn occasions on which they were offered, we have striking illustrations of the true propitiatory character of the Redeemer's death. The ceremonial victims were numerous. There were, for example, the two lambs daily slain and offered in sacrifice. The same authority which appointed these victims has designated Christ '*the Lamb of God.*' He is 'the Lamb,' not only in the innocence of his character, and the meekness of his disposition, but as a sacrifice—for he is '*the Lamb slain.*' To denote his connection with the original institution, and to mark the efficacy of his death in all past ages, he is said to be '*the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;*' and to express the *atoning object* of his death, he is declared 'the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.'—John i. 29.

The ordinance of the Passover is an expressive representation of the expiatory character of Christ. In the 12th chapter of Exodus we find that the paschal lamb had to be slain, and its blood to be sprinkled on the lintel and side-posts of the door. That blood propitiated, or saved from death: for when the destroying angel beheld the blood, he passed over the houses of the Israelites, and they were left in safety, under the protection of the covenant into which they had entered with God by the sacrificial blood. Thus, the victim's life was given as a substitution for the lives of the Israelites. Here was the type. Christ, as the Antitype, is emphatically said to be 'our passover—sacrificed for us.'—1 Cor. v. 7. His precious life was laid down for us; his blood was shed for the remission of our sins; and, when sprinkled upon our conscience, delivers from eternal death, and secures personal and experimental peace with God.

Take another example. On the day of atonement, held annually, there were several victims appointed. One was the '*Scape Goat.*' That animal was led to the door of the tabernacle, and there the hands of the priest were laid upon its head, and the sins of the people solemnly confessed over it. After that interesting ceremony the animal was led away unto a land uninhabited, as the original expresses it, *bearing the iniquities of the people.*—Lev. xvi. 21, 22. Here was a typical

transfer of the guilt of the criminal to the innocent victim. Christ, as the Antitype, is said to have 'once suffered to *bear* the sins of many;' it is declared that 'he bare our sins in his own body on the tree;' and, to make the parallel more complete and emphatic, the prophet says, 'All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way:' but 'THE LORD HATH LAID ON HIM THE INIQUITY OF US ALL.'

On the same day of atonement there were other victims offered. There were the bullock, the ram, and the goat. These were presented in sacrifice; and, after the appointed victims had been slaughtered, their blood was solemnly taken by the high priest into the holy of holies, and sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, *to propitiate—to atone;* and then the high priest might appear before God without danger—might enter with boldness the holy of holies, into the presence of God.—Lev. xvi. Here was the type. Christ, the Antitype, is said to have 'entered once into the holy place not made with hands, but by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption for us. Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as those high priests who entered the holy place once every year, with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now, once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. For, if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctified to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?' Thus, we have before us the intimate connection between the type and the Antitype—the object of the victim under the law, and the object ascribed to our blessed Saviour's passion and death upon the cross. The great work of expiation is constantly set forth as the design of the Redeemer's death.

The expiatory character of the typical victims is further set forth by the fact that neither repentance nor obedience could release men from the obligation of presenting the propitiatory sacrifices to God. They were imperatively required, and the neglect of them was threatened with death and the Divine displeasure. Their performance, with suitable dispositions, secured life and blessings. But, however penitent and holy a man might become, still the appointed sacrifices were indispensable.

The fact is, that one duty cannot supersede another, when we have ability to perform it. As sacrifices could not be a substitute for penitence and good works, so repentance and good works could not be a substitute for sacrifices. Hence we find *both* were required. When the people under the Jewish law had performed both confession and restitution, still sacrifices were indispensable to their pardon. Lev. vi. 1—7 :—'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, If a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie unto his neighbour in that which was delivered him to keep, or in fellowship, or in a thing taken away by violence, or hath deceived his neighbour; or have found that which was lost, and lieth concerning it, and sweareth falsely: in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein; then it shall be, because he hath sinned and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took violently away, or the thing which he hath deceitfully gotten, or that which was delivered him to keep, or the lost thing which he found, or all that about which he hath sworn falsely; he shall even restore it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto, and give unto him to whom it appertaineth, in the day of his trespass offering. And he shall bring his trespass offering unto the Lord, a ram without blemish out of the flock, with thy estimation, for a trespass offering, unto the priest: and the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord: and it shall be forgiven him for any thing of all that he hath done in trespassing therein.'

We take another passage, which refers to *any sin* against God. Numb. v. 5—8 :—'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit, to do a trespass against the Lord, and that person be guilty; then they shall *confess their sin* which they have done: and he shall recompense his trespass with the principal thereof, and add unto it the fifth part thereof, and give it unto him against whom he hath trespassed. But if the man have no kinsman to recompense the trespass unto, let the trespass be recompensed unto the Lord, even to the priest; beside the ram of the atonement, whereby an atonement shall be made for him.'

Now, in these instances (and they apply expressly to sins of every kind) there were *confession, restitution*, and *good works;* yet there was no pardon without shedding of blood. After

all, the ram *must* be slain, and atonement *must* be made for the transgressor. The question spontaneously arises, Why this requirement of blood? Why must a victim be slain to secure pardon to one who is truly penitent, and whose penitence is evinced by his restitution and return to obedience? The atonement gives the explanation. No good works can merit pardon, nor is pardon to be dispensed merely by the exercise of mercy. There must be satisfaction to justice; that satisfaction cannot be rendered by the sinner's penitential tears, nor by his restitution, nor by his return to obedience, nor by all these put together; but by the shedding of blood—by a life being laid down for him; and though the blood of the ram, or the goat, or the heifer could not of themselves atone, they pointed to the great Victim, whose precious life, in the fulness of time, should be sacrificed for the sins of the world. The victims offered were connected with Christ, and, by virtue of their connection with his great anticipated atonement, secured pardon to the penitent believer. Hence these typical victims are called the ἱλασμος —*the atonement*. Just the same term is applied to Christ in the New Testament. Both the type and the Antitype are called the ἱλασμος, the propitiation or atonement; and the act of the sacrificer is ἱλασκεσθαι, to make appeasement or reconciliation. This is the principle which pervades the New Testament. Sin is not to be pardoned without a propitiation. Hence the Apostle tells us, that God hath set forth Christ as a propitiation, that he might be just, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus: which implies that he cannot be just and pardon sin without a propitiation being offered. The same Apostle declares, that 'without shedding of blood there is no remission' of sin. But Christ informs us that his blood was shed in order that we might have this remission; for he plainly says, 'This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for the remission of sins.'—Matt. xxvi. 28; Luke xxii. 20.

Hence it is that, under the Gospel, neither repentance, restitution, nor good works are sufficient of themselves. There must be also faith in the Saviour's blood. For 'we are justified *by* His blood.' 'We have redemption *through* His blood, the forgiveness of sins.'—Rom. v. 9; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14. Faith in the death of Christ connects the soul with the great object and efficacy of that death; and then we pass from death

unto life; we become interested in all the blessings of the covenant; we are restored to the Divine favour, and made heirs of everlasting life.

The vicarious character of the Saviour's death is spoken of under other representations. He is not only our ἱλασμος —that is, *our propitiatory sacrifice*, our atonement, the Lamb of God, and our sin-offering—but he is also our *Ransom*. This word is often applied to the Saviour. We find this word both in the Old and New Testament. It literally means a *price* paid for deliverance from death, captivity, or some other calamity. The word, in Hebrew, is commonly כֹּפֶר, the same word which is elsewhere rendered *atonement;* and, indeed, it has the same meaning—a plain proof that, whether it apply to *propitiation* by sacrifice, or to a *ransom* by price, the same idea is contained—the idea of substitution or satisfaction. In the Septuagint it is rendered by (λύτρον) *lutron;* and in the New Testament this same word, λύτρον, and ἀντίλυτρον, *antilutron*, are applied to Christ as our ransom. But the Scriptures are the best interpreters of themselves. It is always well to compare Scripture with Scripture—to allow the Word of God to speak for itself. This is the method we have adopted hitherto; and, continuing the same safe and satisfactory course, we shall soon see that the word *ransom* conveys the same vicarious meaning as the words *atonement* and *propitiation*.

Take the following example :—As God had saved the Israelites from death when the Egyptians were destroyed, he required a sum of money to be paid by each above twenty years old, as a *ransom price* for his life, and as an *atonement*. Exod. xxx. 11—15 :—'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel after their number, then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, when thou numberest them; that there be no plague among them, when thou numberest them. This they shall give, every one that passeth among them that are numbered, half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary: (a shekel is twenty gerahs :) an half shekel shall be the offering of the Lord. Every one that passeth among them that are numbered, from twenty years old and above, shall give an offering unto the Lord. The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less than half a shekel, when they give an

offering unto the Lord, to make an atonement for your souls.' There can be no mistake about the meaning of the word '*ransom*' in this passage, nor as to the object for which the ransom was paid. It was the price of life—an *offering to save from death* by the plague; and from the payment of this ransom no one of mature age was exempt.

We pass to another part of Scripture, where, again, a sum of money was appointed as a 'ransom'—a commutation, *to deliver from death*. If an ox had gored a person, so that he died, the owner's life was liable to be taken away; but, under certain circumstances, he might *ransom* his life by a sum of money being paid instead. 'If there be laid upon him a sum of money, then he shall give for THE RANSOM OF HIS LIFE whatsoever is laid upon him.' Here the word clearly expresses substitution or satisfaction. It is thus employed in Job, when speaking of God's displeasure against sin: 'Because there is wrath, beware lest he take thee away with his stroke: then a *great ransom* cannot deliver thee.' Again, speaking of God's goodness to man, it is said, 'Then he is gracious unto him, and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom.'—Job xxxvi. 18; xxxiii. 24.

God *has* found a Ransom for us, and a great one. He has laid help upon one mighty to save—Jesus Christ the righteous, who died that we might live, the just for the unjust. He is our Ransom; for he himself declared, that he 'came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a *ransom* (λύτρον) for many.'—Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45. When he bled upon the cross, he became, as the Apostle says, a *ransom* (ἀντίλυτρον) for all, to be testified in due time. These representations of the Saviour's atoning death are too plain to be misunderstood. Language cannot more clearly express the propitiatory efficacy of his precious blood.

Christ is also designated our *Redeemer;* and we are said to have redemption in or by his blood. The word *redemption* is synonymous with *ransom*. It means '*to deliver* by purchase,' or '*to buy again*' that which had been forfeited. Now, seeing that Christ tells us that he would lay down his life as our ransom, we understand what those passages mean which speak of Christ *redeeming* us with his precious blood. 'Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not *redeemed* with corruptible things,

such as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot.'—1 Pet. i. 18, 19. 'Feed the church of God, which he hath *purchased* with his own blood.'—Acts xx. 28. 'For ye are not your own, ye are *bought* with a price.' The whole church of God says, 'Thou art worthy, for thou hast *redeemed* us to God by thy blood.'—Rev. v. 9. But unbelievers are those 'who bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that *bought* them,' and who thus 'bring upon themselves swift destruction.'—2 Peter. ii. 1.

We are not only redeemed from bondage and everlasting death, but the blessings we had forfeited by sin are bought back for us. The Divine favour, adoption into God's family, a restoration to his image, an inheritance of everlasting bliss, and even the immortality and glory of our body—all these blessings were lost, but through the Redeemer's death they are restored. They are our 'purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.'—Eph. i. 14.

Many objections are sometimes alleged against the term *satisfaction* to justice; but without foundation. If Christ's death be an atonement for sin, it is undoubtedly such a satisfaction as renders it compatible with justice for God to pardon sin; and without which, as the Apostle Paul teaches, he could not pardon sin compatibly with justice.—Rom. iii. 25, 26. Nor is the *term* 'satisfaction' unscriptural, any more than the doctrine. Indeed, this word is expressly employed by inspired writers, and that in exactly the same sense. Hence we read in the Book of Numbers xxxv. 30—33: 'Whoso killeth any person, the murderer shall be put to death by the mouth of witnesses: but one witness shall not testify against any person to cause him to die. Moreover ye shall take *no satisfaction* for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death: but he shall be surely put to death. And ye shall take no satisfaction for him that is fled to the city of his refuge, that he should come again to dwell in the land, until the death of the priest. So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are: for blood it defileth the land: and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it.' And though here the term in Hebrew is כֹּפֶר (*kopher*), and in

Greek λυτρον (*lutron*), yet the context clearly shows that '*satisfaction*' is the thing meant. Although for murder no satisfaction could be made, yet for other sins *satisfaction* might be made—that is, an atonement might be offered.

Since, then, the *doctrine* of 'satisfaction' is thus shown to be scriptural, there can be no valid objection to the *phraseology*. In fact, satisfaction and atonement are clearly synonymous, and we have seen that the Hebrew text employs the same word (כפר) to express the meaning of both; and, therefore, divines are as much authorized by Scripture to use the word 'satisfaction' as the word 'atonement.' If the sacrifices of the law could not make 'satisfaction' for the murderer, and cleanse him from sin, the blood of our Lord can; for 'the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin:' therefore it makes *satisfaction* for all sin. However, in the death of Christ there is satisfaction made, not to justice merely, but to wisdom, to holiness, to the Divine government; and in another sense, to love itself. It presents a valid reason why all the attributes of Deity can concur in the bestowment of pardon to 'him that believeth in Jesus.'—Rom. iii. 26.

Attempts have been made to ridicule the doctrine of our redemption through the death of Christ, by asserting, that as we are held in bondage by Satan, the redemption price should have been paid to *him*. But this is a wicked caricature of the doctrine. It is true we are held in bondage by Satan; but he is merely the officer of Divine justice, permitted to tyrannize over men, so long as they continue to reject Christ. But it is *God's* law we have broken; it is *God's* government to which we are amenable; and it is to *God's* justice the atonement or satisfaction is made. This price being paid, freedom is procured for all who will accept it. Divine justice being satisfied and honoured, Satan's power over us is virtually dissolved: our prison doors are open, and any moment we choose we may leave the dark dominion of our tyrant and walk at large, and rejoice in the liberty of the sons of God. This is the scriptural representation of the atonement, by the death of Jesus Christ our Lord.

The idea of '*satisfaction*,' or substitution, is so clearly taught, that Christ is said to have '*become a curse for us*,' that we might be delivered from the curse of sin. Having broken

God's law, we had come under its curse; 'for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.' But, says the Apostle, 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.'—Gal. iii. 10, 13.

Now the '*law*' here alluded to is evidently not the ceremonial but the moral law, for two reasons. First, because the curses referred to are in Deut. xxi. 23, and xxvii. 26; and these refer to the moral law; and secondly, because Gentiles, never having been under the ceremonial law, could never be under its curse. But all men are under the curse of the moral law, because 'all have sinned.' Christ delivers mankind from all the curses of sin. This is owing to his death, which satisfies Divine justice in our behalf. The holy law being honoured by Christ's obedience, and its claims answered by his atoning death, its curses are removed from all who are willing to accept of deliverance; its penalties can never be inflicted on the soul that takes refuge in Christ; for HE was wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities; and his soul was made an offering for sin.

The word *reconciliation* is another term applied to the work of the Saviour, and this word also is designed to express the *atoning* object of his death. Indeed, in the Hebrew, it is again the same word, כפר, which is used; and the examples of its use, in reference to sacrifices, show that it expresses the same meaning. Take the following instance:—'And one lamb out of the flock . . . . for a meat-offering, for a burnt-offering, and for a peace-offering, to make *reconciliation* for them, saith the Lord God.'—Ezek. xlv. 15. The prophet Daniel applies this same word כפר to the Messiah's sacrifice, 'Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and *to make reconciliation for iniquity*.'—Dan. ix. 24.

Thus the Hebrew Scriptures apply the same word to the type and to the antitype, to the victims under the law and to the Lamb of God himself; and it is remarkable that the Septuagint does the same. In each instance the Greek word is ἱλασκω; and when the Apostle Paul speaks of the object of the Redeemer's sacrifice, he uses precisely the same word as

the Septuagint; for Christ, he declares, is 'a faithful and merciful High Priest, to make reconciliation (ἐξιλασκεσθαι) for the sins of the people.'—Heb. ii. 17. In conformity with this usage we have already seen that the atoning efficacy of Christ's death is expressed by ἱλασμος, a noun derived from the same verb. Thus, then, it is evident that the words 'reconciliation,' 'atonement,' 'ransom,' 'satisfaction,' and 'propitiation,' are synonymous; for in the original the words are *precisely* the same; and in each of the instances quoted, the word 'atonement' might as well have been used by our translators as the word 'reconciliation,' 'ransom,' 'propitiation,' &c. Indeed it is manifest that our translators regarded the words as expressing essentially the same meaning, and as teaching the same doctrine; and therefore they employed any one of these terms indifferently to convey the meaning of the inspired writers.

We are aware that the Scriptures sometimes speak of man being reconciled to God; but they never speak of the sacrifice of Christ being presented to man to turn away man's displeasure. Here is the difference: *God* is the offended party; and the Scriptures always show that the sacrifice was presented to *him*, and this fact determines the character and object of the Saviour's death.

Thus, then, to reconcile is *to atone—to propitiate* not *man*, but that *Holy Being* against whom our sins have been committed; and this was accomplished by a substitutionary victim. Now, observe how this effect of reconciliation is ascribed to the Saviour's death in the New Testament. Rom. v., beginning at the 6th verse—'For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die.' Here is substitution—one life for another. 'But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' This is substitution—the Saviour dying in our stead. 'Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement;' or, as we have it in the

margin, the 'reconciliation.' Now, in this passage, the death of Christ is the *procuring* cause of a state of reconciliation betwixt God and man. How? By a *moral* influence proceeding from the Saviour's death, and acting upon the human heart? No; for the sacrifice is offered, not to propitiate man, to remove his displeasure, but to God *for* man—in man's behalf, and in man's *stead*. And believing in Christ as our atoning sacrifice, we are justified—we are saved from *wrath;* not our wrath against God, but the wrath of God against us, and which our sins justly deserve. Thus, we receive the *atonement*—the reconciliation which Christ has procured for us: we receive and rejoice in God's pardoning love.

Whenever the Scriptures speak of man being reconciled to God, it is in a sense widely different from that of an atonement, as we shall presently see. The sacrificial death of our Lord hath placed us in circumstances in which God and man may be reconciled; but it is necessary that man should cast away his weapons of rebellion, in order that the reconciliation may be consummated. The legal barrier to our pardon is removed by the death of the Saviour, but our enmity of heart must also be laid aside. This doctrine is taught throughout the Scriptures, and is made especially prominent in the following passage:—'And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by *Jesus Christ*, and hath given to us the ministry of *reconciliation;* to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.'—2 Cor. v. 18—21.

Here man is besought to be reconciled to God; but we see that the embassy is based upon the great fact that God is waiting to be reconciled to man, *because* Christ has already laid down his life as a sacrifice to God in our behalf. Just observe the connection betwixt the embassy of the Apostle and the great fact of the atonement:—'Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.' Why? what is

the foundation of this entreaty? What is the basis of man's hope? What is the grand reason why we may expect mercy from God? The next verse declares it: 'For he hath made him (even Christ) to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.' The intelligent reader will see that the language of the Apostle, in the passage quoted, implies that the reconciliation of God to man, and of man to God, are distinct in themselves, and are effected by widely different means. To reconcile God to man the Saviour died a propitiatory sacrifice—to reconcile man to God, man is *besought*, he is *entreated*, by the embassy of the Christian ministry—besought to repent and believe in the efficacy of the Saviour's death in his behalf.

5. It is in harmony with this great doctrine of substitution, and it presents additional confirmation of its truth, that in many parts of the New Testament Christ is set forth as having died '*for us*'—suffered '*for us*.' The prepositions used in such cases are *ἀντὶ* and *ὑπὲρ*. And though they sometimes mean '*on account of*,' '*for the sake of*,' they also mean '*instead of*,' and clearly imply *substitution*. Take a few examples; such, in the first place, as are unconnected with any doctrinal question. We begin with *ἀντὶ* (*anti*). Matt. ii. 22: Archelaus is said to have reigned *ἀντὶ Ἡρώδου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ*, *instead* of Herod his father. Luke xi. 11: 'If a son ask a fish, will he' (*μὴ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει*), 'will he *for* (instead of) a fish give him a serpent?' *Ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος*—'An eye *for* an eye, a tooth *for* a tooth.' Does not *ἀντὶ*, in these examples, clearly imply substitution? So, when Christ is said to have become a ransom (*ἀντὶ πολλῶν*) for many, it is as evident as language can make a subject evident, that the *vicarious* nature of his sacrifice is intended. Take a few examples from the other preposition, *ὑπὲρ*. The Apostle Paul, writing to his beloved Philemon, and speaking of his servant Onesimus, says, 'Whom I would have retained with me, that in *thy stead* (*ὑπὲρ σοῦ*) he might have ministered unto me.' Is not *substitution* here intended—the service of Onesimus for the service of Philemon? In 2 Cor. v. 20, he says, 'Now then we are ambassadors *for* Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in *Christ's stead* (*ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ*) be ye reconciled to God.' Here is *substitution;* and if

substitution be intended here, it is equally intended in the next sentence, where the very same preposition is used:—'For he hath made him to be sin (*a sin-offering*) *for us*.' In Rom. xvi. 3, 4, Paul, adverting with gratitude to the devotedness of Priscilla and Aquila, whom he calls his helpers in Christ, says, 'Greet Priscilla and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus: who have laid down their own necks (ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου) for my life.' What does this mean but *substitution?*—that they had on some occasion voluntarily offered their own lives to save the Apostle's life? And such is the *substitution* of the Saviour's life, who died that we might live. Such is the *substitution* intended when the Apostle affirms of our glorious Redeemer that he 'suffered *for* us;' that 'he died *for* the ungodly;' that 'he tasted death *for* every man;' that Christ Jesus died, 'the just *for* the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh.' 'Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.'—1 Peter iii. 18; ii. 24.

In the face of this evidence, how preposterous to speak of the death of our Lord as being that of a martyr, or as being '*for us*,' in the same sense as a patriot dies for his country, or as saving us by the moral influence his death exerts on our hearts! The Holy Scriptures constantly speak of it as substitutionary—as expiatory in its character, object, and efficacy. Martyrdom and vicarious atonement are quite distinct and different in their nature and object, and the Scriptures always distinguish the atonement of Christ from the death of any martyr, however holy, devoted, or useful. At an early age some holy men sealed the truth with their blood. Righteous Abel fell a victim to his brother's malice because of his fidelity to God: his own works were good, and his brother's evil. James was slain with the sword for the honour of his God. Stephen was stoned to death, and prayed for his murderers with his expiring breath. Paul knew very well that he would have to die a martyr. Yet the blood of these men is never said to propitiate—is never said to be sprinkled upon men's consciences—to purge them from dead works; is never said to justify the soul—to give peace with God—to cleanse from sin. No, never. Yet the theory which makes the Saviour a man only, and his death merely that of a martyr, ascribes to the death of martyrs just the same kind of efficacy or influence

as it does to the blood of Christ. How is it, then, that their death is never once mentioned in Scripture as saving men's souls? Clearly because the theory is not the doctrine of the New Testament, but is another gospel, which God does not own, and which has no resemblance to the pure Gospel of Christ.

If the object of Christ's death were merely to seal the truth with his blood, and to exert a moral influence upon the heart of man, the death of the apostles would, of course, have the same effect; and Christ, instead of being our *only* Saviour, would be merely one Saviour out of many. If atonement and martyrdom were the same, we should have as many saviours as there are martyrs; but there is no Saviour but one, because there is no atonement but one, even that of Christ. It is a remarkable fact that in the Holy Scriptures the death of our Lord and the death of the apostles are placed in *contrast*, or such a difference is marked between them that their object *cannot* be the same. The Apostle, in 1 Cor. xv. 1—3, says, 'Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that *Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures*.' Now there is here an object ascribed to Christ's death which can belong to no other person—*Christ died for our sins*. This the Apostle published to them '*first of all*.' But no other being died for our sins. And when the same Apostle is reproving the same people for their strifes and divisions, and glorying in man, he demands, '*Was Paul crucified for you?*' No: but Paul knew full well that he would have to die for the truth; and he knew that others had died for the truth. Yet there was no such efficacy in their death. The Corinthians, therefore, were not to glory in Paul, or in any man, but in Christ who had died for them; and the object of his death, as a sacrifice for their sins, was the reason why they were to glory in him, and not to glory in man. Christ was their Saviour, and no one else.

The death of martyrs has an influence, it is true—an influence not only upon the heart of man, but upon the administration

of God's moral government; but that influence is in perfect contrast with the influence of the atonement. It appeals to Divine justice, and calls for vengeance upon the enemies of God. The blood of Abel cried to God from the earth; but it cried for justice upon the murderer: but the blood of Jesus speaketh better things than the blood of Abel; it pleadeth for mercy and salvation to sinful men. The souls described as being under the altar—not *upon* it, for the altar is the place on which the great sacrifice of Christ alone must be—the souls *under* the altar—the souls of those who died for the truth—are described as crying, 'How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?'—Rev. vi. 10. *That* is the specific influence which the blood of martyrs has. It appeals to Heaven for vengeance upon the guilty. But the blood of the slaughtered Lamb does not cry for *vengeance* even upon the Saviour's enemies, but for salvation—the salvation of the worst of men—the salvation of those who imbrued their hands in his most precious blood. Here is the difference, then, betwixt the blood of martyrs and the blood of Jesus Christ. The one calls for *vengeance;* the other *propitiates*—it turns aside vengeance, and procures favour and everlasting life.

6. Hence it is that all the blessings of grace, salvation, and eternal life come to us '*through Jesus Christ.*' *Through* him we are pardoned. 'Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that *through* this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins.'—Acts xiii. 38. 'Being justified freely by his grace *through* the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.'—Rom. iii. 24. 'In whom we have redemption *through* his blood, the forgiveness of sins.'—Eph. i. 7. *Through* him we have peace. 'Being justified by faith, we have peace with God *through* our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.'—Rom. v. 1, 2. *Through* him we have joy. 'And not only so, but we also joy in God *through* our Lord Jesus Christ.'—Rom. v. 11. All this is beautifully consistent. Since by his death he procures our salvation, it is of course *through* him we receive our pardon, our peace, and our joy.

Christ being our Atoner, he is also our Mediator, and *through* him we have the privilege of approaching God at all

times and on all occasions. Hence the Saviour himself taught, in John xiv. 13, 14—'And whatsoever ye shall ask in *my name*, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in *my name*, I will do it.' Chap. xv. 16—'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father *in my name*, he may give it you.' Chap. xvi. 23, 24—'Verily, verily'—a double affirmation—a solemn form of words—'I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father *in my name*, he will give it you. Hitherto have ye asked nothing *in my name*: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.'

Thus they were commanded to pray *in the Saviour's name*. And as he is our propitiatory sacrifice, whose blood has sprinkled the mercy-seat, and rendered it accessible; and since he is our great High Priest who ever liveth to make intercession for us, we see the important reason why we are to pray *in his name*. It is a name in which the Father is ever well pleased; and though *our* name is unworthy, his blessed name is ever worthy and ever available. And hence it is that the name of Christ is the only name in which we are to pray. The names of prophets and apostles, however holy, however exalted, are never to be employed by us in prayer, as presenting reasons why God should bless us. There is no name but that of Jesus through which we can have access to God; for, says our Lord, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.'—John xiv. 6. 'Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'—1 Cor. iii. 11. 'Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.'—Acts iv. 12.

It is *through* the undertaking of Christ that the dead are to be raised. 'For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.' 'For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.' But how is it that we are to be made alive by Christ? Not merely because he taught the doctrine of a future life; for others had taught it hundreds of years before his incarnation: not merely because he himself had risen from the dead; for others had been raised

from the dead before the Saviour's resurrection—but because his death has *procured* our life; because he has opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers; and because his death does away with the original curse of sin, and procures for the world a glorious resurrection—a glorious resurrection to be given to all them that believe in him.

It is also *through* Christ that we have eternal life given unto us. 'That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life.' How? Not through the Divine clemency merely, but '*by Jesus Christ our Lord*.'—Rom. v. 21. Christ is its procuring cause, and therefore there must be an efficacy in that death which procures eternal life for man. He has not merely taught it; not merely has he ascended to heaven as a pledge of our immortal life, *but he has procured it by the shedding of his precious blood*. Now, the atonement explains all this; and this is further illustrated by the scriptural truth to which we before alluded—the eternal happiness of those who die in infancy.

This doctrine explains the reason also *why* our Lord's death is so constantly exhibited to the view of men—why he is constantly set forth as a *Saviour*. 'For this is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom,' says the Apostle, 'I am chief.' He 'is the Saviour of all men, but especially of those that believe.' He died to save all men, but those who believe in him for themselves are especially and personally saved. His name signifies that he is a Saviour, and it was given unto him for this reason. 'Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.' For this reason men are expressly commanded to believe in him; and their faith is to have a direct reference to his blood—his death, his sacrificial character. If men are commanded to behold him, they must behold him as 'the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.' If they are required to have faith, it must be 'faith' in his *blood* as a propitiation. Now, there is reason and consistency in all this; because it is 'his blood which justifies'—'his blood which purges the conscience'—'his blood which cleanseth from all sin.'

Since, then, we are told that there is no salvation by the law of works; since Christ is exhibited as our '*Saviour*,' and

our '*only Saviour;*' since he is set forth as our '*Propitiation*,' our '*Ransom*,' our '*Redeemer*,' our '*Reconciler*,' our '*Atonement*,' our '*Mediator;*' since he is the sole '*Procurer*' of pardon, of peace, of holiness, and of heaven; since *through* him alone we have *access* to the Father; since by his death we are delivered from *damnation;* since by him we obtain *every* blessing of the covenant, and, finally, *everlasting life*, there *is* an efficacy in his death; and there can be no wonder that an efficacy is everywhere ascribed to his *name*, his *blood*, his *death*. No wonder at the consolation it gave, the joy it inspired, the triumphs it afforded—no wonder that the apostles gloried in the cross, and accounted his reproach an honour—no wonder that men were overpowered with a sense of their mighty obligations—no wonder that words were found inadequate to express his love, and the comprehensive grasp of the human intellect too confined and too feeble to conceive his worth—no wonder that inspired writers heap term upon term, and epithet upon epithet, and figure upon figure—no wonder that they search through nature and art for figures of the vast, the sublime, the rich, and the wonderful, to help the labouring mind to utter its sense of obligation to Christ, for the shedding of his blood as the ransom of our souls from everlasting death—no wonder that, long ere he appeared, the prophetic bards dwelt upon his atoning death, and struck their lyres to sweeter notes and louder numbers when they sung of the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow—no wonder that John the Baptist, standing, as he did, between the two dispensations, the Old and the New, should direct the inquiring eye to Jesus, should turn his attention from all but Jesus, and exclaim, 'Behold the Lamb of God!'—no wonder that the apostles resolved to know nothing amongst men but Jesus, and him crucified—no wonder that the whole Church on earth celebrates the efficacy of his blood, and ascribes all her salvation unto him,—'Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever'—no wonder that the whole Church in heaven celebrates the same efficacy of the Saviour's blood, and sings of the same obligations, 'Thou art worthy, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation'—no wonder that the angels

become fired with the delightful theme, and unite in the pealing anthem to Him who died for the world's salvation—no wonder that their mighty minds are interested, and their noblest powers are exerted in pondering over that blessed and glorious theme—no wonder that they unite in the song of praise that bursts forth from every human tongue, and fills the arch of heaven, proclaiming, 'Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.' No wonder that his name fills all heaven with rapture, and eternity with songs of gratitude and adoration. He is worthy of it. He is God as well as man—man as well as God, the two natures combined in one person—bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh—lifting man up to heaven, and bringing Deity down to earth—obeying the law which man had ungratefully violated, exemplifying its purity—honouring its righteous claims—vindicating its Divine authority; and thus preparing the way for the outgoing of boundless mercy—that the guilty might be forgiven, that the lost might be saved, that the sceptre of forgiveness might be touched, that this world of sinners might be brought to embrace the Divine benevolence secured to them by his atoning blood, and ultimately be raised to eternal bliss. Hallelujah to the Lamb!

We have thus adduced a few positive proofs from the Holy Scriptures of the truth of this doctrine. We have shown that the Scriptures declare that Christ's expiation was necessary, in order to harmonize the claims of justice with the purposes of mercy; and we have shown that the Scriptures assign to his death that *expiatory efficacy*, in every variety of phraseology and representation:—in his character as our Great High Priest; first offering his own body as a sacrifice; and secondly, presenting in the holy place the fragrant incense of his own intercession: in his character as the antitype of the victims offered under the Jewish law: in his character as our Redeemer, paying the λυτρον, or redemption price of his precious life: in his character as our Reconciler, propitiating offended justice, and procuring peace and pardon for rebellious man: in his character as our Mediator—as the only medium of man's approach to God in prayer, and the only medium through which all the blessings of grace and glory are to be bestowed. In every form, indeed, which the most instructive figures and the plainest

statements—in which the most striking antitheses and the most minute comparisons—in which the brightest prophecies and the most abundant promises—in which the richest experience of saints on earth, and the triumphs of glorified spirits in heaven, can set forth this blessed doctrine, it is set forth in the Holy Scriptures.

In the next chapter we shall extend our views on this doctrine, answer a variety of objections, and show its adaptation to meet the necessities of man, and promote the glory of God.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ATONEMENT.

We have already unfolded the necessity and nature of the Atonement, and adduced a number of scriptural proofs and illustrations of this important doctrine; but the subject is not exhausted. It is placed before us in a vast variety of representations. It is a golden vein which interlaces the whole mine of Revelation; and in whatever part we search, we find it. We might as well attempt to abstract solidity from matter, gravitation from the universe, or personal identity from consciousness, as attempt to eradicate the atonement from the Bible. God has so effectually secured this gracious doctrine, that the whole texture of revealed truth must be destroyed, the phraseology of Scripture remodelled, and the entire foundations of revealed religion subverted, before men can remove it from the Christian system.

When our Lord explained to his disciples the important *object* of his death, he 'began at Moses and all the prophets, and expounded unto them in ALL the Scriptures the things concerning *himself*;' and he said, 'Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations.' His atoning death was the theme of every inspired writer, and cannot be abstracted from them.

It is in vain to plead that the opposite doctrine is based

upon a different *interpretation* of Scripture; it is based either upon gross ignorance, or a rejection of the Scriptures. The devil would willingly take the Scriptures for his text-book, if he could only propagate his own interpretation. It is no more disrespect towards God to reject the *letter* of his word, than to pervert its obvious *meaning*. It is, indeed, more honest and consistent to avow our rejection of the Scriptures, than to wrest and distort them from their obvious meaning; and there is as much hope of converting the man who rejects the Divine authority of our religion, as the man who is habitually resisting the clear, steady light of truth, which the Bible pours upon the essential doctrines of Christianity. The sophistical evasion to which he is compelled to resort to stifle conviction, warps his moral principle, and in time so blunts his perception, that he is disqualified for admitting the truth, even when it shines with the brightest evidence. Thus it is that the precious gems of truth are hid from the wise and prudent, while they are revealed unto babes. Even so, righteous Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight.

To the evidence already adduced in support of the Atonement, we shall furnish a few additional arguments and illustrations.

I. *The doctrine of Atonement is taught in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper.*

Christianity presents religion under a beautiful simplicity. Disencumbered of Jewish rites, it is rather a religion of principles than of ceremonies. Yet there are two symbolical and instructive rites enjoined—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These rites are intended to present to the senses a recognition of the leading doctrines of Christianity. While baptism implies the doctrine of our natural depravity, and the necessity of the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit, it places before the Church a public and perpetual recognition of the *Trinity*. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in like manner evinces the importance of the *Atonement*, and the purpose of God that this doctrine shall stand broadly exhibited to mankind down to the end of time. A careful attention to the words of Christ when he appointed the ordinance, will fully establish this view. 'And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto

them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood which is shed for you;' and St Matthew adds, 'shed for the remission of sins.'—Luke xxii. 15—20; Matt. xxvi. 26. Every circumstance, every word throws around this ordinance a solemn interest. It was appointed just before the Redeemer suffered. He was about to experience an awful agony, and to endure a most excruciating death. It was, therefore, important the disciples should know the object for which he died. He tells them expressly that his body was to be broken and his blood to be shed for them; and that not as a martyr or as an example merely, but '*for the remission of sins.*' To render this object still more obvious, he connects the well-known design of the passover with the design of his own death, and speaks of the former as being about to receive its accomplishment in himself—to be '*fulfilled in the kingdom of God.*'—Luke xxii. 18. They knew that the paschal lamb was a sacrificial victim; they were here taught that Christ himself was to become such a victim. They knew that the blood of the paschal lamb was shed to deliver from death; they were here taught that Christ's precious blood was to be shed to deliver from the consequences of sin. The passover was *commemorative* of an important event—of the signal deliverance from the sword of the destroying angel. They were now commanded to observe a *new* commemorative rite—to break the bread in remembrance of Christ's broken body, and to drink the wine in remembrance of his blood shed, as of the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. That this ordinance is of permanent obligation is also evident. Hence, St Paul enforces it, adopting the very words of the Saviour in which it was originally ordained; and he further says, 'As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's

death TILL HE COME.'—1 Cor. xi. 26. Thus, this sacred institution constantly places before the church a visible memorial of the Saviour's *atoning* death. It is remarkable, that those doctrines which Unitarians reject are those which God has most carefully provided to preserve. He has placed them under a double security, published them as a sunbeam in his Word, and incorporated them in his ordinances. The only symbolical rites which are instituted are those which are designed to throw a special guard around the holy Trinity and the Atonement. 'Christ our passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.'—1 Cor. v. 7, 8. We wonder not, that some who reject the Trinity and the Atonement, should discard also those precious ordinances, which so strikingly hold them forth to our view.

II. *The priesthood of Christ is fraught with instruction on this important doctrine.*

That there was a real typical connection between the Jewish priesthood and the atonement of Christ is clearly taught in the sacred volume; the whole phraseology of the New Testament is based upon this connection. The Apostle Paul discourses on this subject copiously; and his application of Old Testament Scripture is expressly authenticated by the testimony of the Holy Ghost. He says, 'But this *Person* (or *Being*), because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself. For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.'—Heb. vii. 24—28.

Again, in the 9th chapter of the same epistle, we have the same connection maintained between the ceremonial law and the Gospel of Christ—between the Jewish priesthood and

the true and effectual priesthood of our Saviour. 'Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat, of which we cannot now speak particularly. Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?'—ver. 1—14.

In a subsequent part of the same chapter he observes:—'And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; *and without shedding of blood is no remission.* It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the

true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year, with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.'—ver. 22—28.

To these passages a multitude of others might be added, but the present are sufficient for the purpose of forming the substratum of our argument and materials for its illustration. The great truths which are broadly maintained, and stand out in bold relief in these passages, are—

First,—That the connection between the office of the Jewish priesthood and the work of Christ is not adventitious, but *essential*—is not imaginative, but real and proper. The Apostle affirms this to be the express testimony of the HOLY GHOST—verse 8: and in verse 15th of the following chapter, he repeats this affirmation. To deny, therefore, the typical connection between the Jewish priesthood and the office of the Saviour is to contradict the direct testimony of the Holy Ghost.

Secondly,—This connection being established, it is further taught that the functions typically performed by the Jewish priesthood, were performed *truly* and *effectually* by the Saviour; and that therefore he is properly the great High Priest of the human family. This again is the testimony of the *Holy Ghost*. The due consideration of these truths is of immense importance, as they terminate all dispute about the nature and intention of types, place before us the spiritual design of the Mosaic institution, and present irrefragable evidence that the atonement has pervaded and distinguished every dispensation. In this view we see that the Jewish priesthood and its various rites were prophetic emblems of Christ—that what the prophets express in *words*, the typical rites express in appropriate scenes and actions. The one is addressed to the eye and the other to the ear; but both speak the same language, testify of the same Saviour, and represent the atoning object and efficacy of his death.

Many instructive coincidences might be pointed out between the Jewish priesthood and the character and work of the Redeemer, but our limits forbid enlargement. As we are not writing an essay on the types, but a short treatise on the atonement, we must confine our attention to a few prominent and expressive characteristics, bearing immediately upon the subject before us. Now, the peculiar functions of the Jewish priesthood were those of 'offering sacrifices and making intercession for the people;' and as these have a remarkable reference to the work of our Lord, they claim our especial attention.

I. *One important function of the Jewish priesthood was to offer sacrifices.* 'For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things *pertaining* to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins."—Heb. v. 1. This, then, was the constant and peculiar function of the principal ministers of religion; and while it legally pertained to no other persons, it was their daily and almost constant employment. Each day the slaughtered victims were presented on the altar, and on special occasions, as at the passover and the great day of atonement, &c., numerous victims were slain, and their blood being sprinkled or poured at the foot of the altar, they were offered in sacrifice to God. The chief work of Christ, our High Priest, was to offer a sacrifice for sin. Whatever else he did was subordinate to this, and subservient to its accomplishment. All had a *special* reference to this, and was undertaken on account of it, and from this derives its importance and value. But the offering of Christ was *himself*—his own immaculate life. He was the PRIEST and the VICTIM too. 'Not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his OWN BLOOD he entered once into the holy place.' 'He gave HIMSELF a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.' Respecting this sacrifice, we observe that it is characterized by all the qualities requisite to render it available in our behalf, for—

(*a*) *It was the sacrifice of an innocent victim.* The Jewish priests were required to have a ceremonial purity; hence it was ordained, 'No man that hath a blemish of the seed of Aaron the priest shall come nigh to offer the offerings of the Lord.' —Lev. xxi. 21. Still the priests were subjects of depravity and guilt, and had to offer sacrifices for their own sins before

they were qualified to offer sacrifices for the people.—Heb. vii. 27. These ordinances intimated the necessity of a moral purity —a spiritual perfection in the character of him who was to become the High Priest for the sins of the world. The Scriptures are emphatic in asserting the moral purity of the Saviour. In his nature he was holy; for being conceived by the miraculous agency of the Holy Ghost, he did not participate in human depravity. The nature thus pure, he preserved immaculate through life—he continued 'holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners.'—Heb. vii. 26. Though he breathed in a pestiferous atmosphere, and was surrounded by contagious example, he never contracted a single stain, never infringed one jot or tittle of the Divine law. When his most malignant enemies eagerly watched him, they could find no fault in him, not a single discrepancy betwixt his teachings and his life. When assailed by the powers of darkness, they could find nothing in him, not a latent spark of depraved emotion. When searched by the penetrating eye of Omniscience, he was found approved; and once and again a voice proclaimed from the parted sky, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' He resisted every temptation to evil, he fulfilled every precept, he accomplished the whole of his Father's will. The inflexible requirements of the Divine law, as the standard of perfect holiness, were applied to all the thoughts of his mind, the affections of his heart, and the actions of his life, and were obeyed; and, finally, 'he offered himself to God, as a lamb without blemish and without spot.'

(*b*) The perfect innocence and obedience of our great High Priest invested the law with sanctity and honour: it 'magnified the law and made it honourable.' The transgressions of a guilty world had degraded the law and trampled it in the dust; but the obedience of Christ put honour upon it in the sight of the intelligent universe—exhibiting its dignity, upholding its authority, and commanding respect for all its holy requirements and obligations.

(*c*) This obedience, too, proclaimed the Redeemer's fitness to become a vicarious sacrifice for sin, and proved that he was purely a vicarious sacrifice. The wages of sin is death, and he who violates the law is exposed to its penalty; but he who fulfils its requirements is entitled to its protection, for the

same law says, Do these things and live.—Gal. iii. 12. The Saviour, therefore, being innocent and holy, was subject to no curse, liable to no penalty which that law denounces; and, in consequence, exposed to neither suffering nor death on his own account. On the contrary, his innocence and obedience justly entitled him to the approval of his Father, to a state of unqualified happiness and everlasting life. This fact proves that the death of our great High Priest was, in the strictest sense, vicarious. It supports and strengthens all those passages which declare that he died for *others*—as a substitutionary victim. For, if the Redeemer was legally entitled to happiness, why did he suffer? If the law itself, which he honoured, gave him a claim to the uninterrupted smile of his heavenly Father, why should it please the Father to bruise him and put him to grief? And why should his life of spotless holiness close in languishing under the judicial displeasure of his Father, in exclaiming, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' If justice secure to perfect obedience immortality—a freedom from death—why did justice take away his life? It is plain that the Saviour, viewed as a holy and innocent human being merely, could *not* die on his own account. The holy law would protect him as a wall of fire round about him, and justice itself require his uninterrupted existence and happiness. The question then arises, Why did justice admit, and not only admit, but require his sufferings and death? There is but one answer, and that is furnished by the doctrine which is everywhere taught in the Scriptures, namely, 'He suffered the just for the unjust.' 'Messiah was cut off, but not for himself.' 'For the transgression of my people was he stricken.'

Thus the innocence and obedience of the Saviour irresistibly leads to the doctrine of the atonement. The death of a perfectly innocent and holy being is altogether *singular*. It never occurred but once. It stands alone without any parallel in the moral history of the universe. It is *anomalous* as well as unique, and, on the Unitarian scheme, is contradictory to the principles of the Divine government. It is an enigma—a profound and awful mystery—which nothing but the atonement can solve. The propitiatory character of Christ is not merely in harmony with his perfect holiness, but is absolutely necessary in order to account for his sufferings and death.

(*d*) This doctrine explains also the mystery of the dreadful intensity and extremity of the Redeemer's sufferings. They were not only remarkable as the sufferings of an innocent victim, but they were such as no created being could inflict, and such as no reason but one can explain. No expiring scene was ever like that of our Lord; none so awful in mental anguish. It is a perfect contrast to what we might expect from an innocent and holy being; it is a contrast to the death of martyrs. Death is painful; but when there is no guilt to sting the conscience, no future punishment to harass the soul, death can inflict only corporeal pain. From innocence, therefore, we look for composure and joy in death—from perfect moral rectitude we expect exultation and triumph. Even Socrates showed calmness in death, and Christian martyrs have often exhibited rapture. Joy has lit up their countenances; seraphic sounds have escaped from their lips; notes of ecstacy have often been uttered while the flame has risen around them; and they have expired, exclaiming, 'None but Christ! none but Christ!' But what a contrast is the scene which preceded and attended the dying hours of the blessed Redeemer! Look at him in the garden! Not a ray of joy beams on his countenance—not an expression of triumph is uttered; but he is prostrate on the earth, covered with the sweat of his own blood! Hear the groans which escape from him, and break upon the silence of the midnight hour! Hear him utter the lamentation—'My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death!' And hear him, too, when expiring, exclaim, 'My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?' Now, what was the cause of the Saviour's intense and awful sufferings? What made him groan in agony? What made him utter such deep and affecting exclamations? Was it personal guilt? He had none. Was it the fear of ordinary death? His moral courage forbade it. Was it the hand of external violence? He was alone in the garden, prostrate on the ground. No one was near him. What, then, fetched those deep and awful sighs? What caused the blood to be propelled through the pores of his skin, and to fall upon the earth in clotted drops? What made this innocent and holy Being endure what the most guilty and abandoned profligate never experienced? The atonement explains it. Though he had no guilt of his own,

he was made accountable for our transgressions: he groaned under our guilt. His righteous soul was made an offering for sin. It pleased the Father to bruise him; he hath put him to grief. 'He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.' Such sufferings he could not endure for himself, but he endured them for the world; for he is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. While the innocence of the Saviour proves that his death was vicarious, it proves also that it *must* be acceptable in our behalf—a sacrifice well-pleasing to God.

(*e*) Jesus, our High Priest, was a voluntary victim. None but a free-will offering could be acceptable as a sacrifice to God: such an offering was that presented by Christ. As a holy and innocent Being, he was under no *moral* necessity from the law to suffer on his own account; and as a *Divine* Being, and therefore totally independent, he could be under no *physical* necessity to suffer for others. Hence it follows that his great undertaking must have been voluntary, and sprang from his free and boundless benevolence. From his exalted throne he beheld our apostate world helpless and undone, and he came down to our rescue, and sprang into the arms of death, to take the prey from the mighty. Every representation the Scriptures give shows that it was a voluntary offering. He entered into covenant with the Father to become our ransom, and to have his heel bruised in our behalf. A covenant is a voluntary compact. His own Spirit indited the prophecies which spoke of his sufferings, and the glory that should follow; and that inspiration was afforded from his own good pleasure. In the Old Testament announcements he is described as contemplating the insufficiency of typical victims, and exclaiming, 'Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt-offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.'—Heb. x. 5—7. When the Redeemer appeared in the flesh, he often declared that his death was voluntary. He said, 'Therefore doth my Father love me because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.'—John

x. 17, 18. When he was about to suffer, and had the awful scene of his sufferings immediately before him, he evidenced the same free consent to be the victim for our transgressions, exclaiming, 'The hour is come . . . . now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name.' —John xii. 23, 27, 28. In the very midst of his agonies, when he was sweating drops of blood, he exclaimed, 'Father, thy will be done.' The apostles are express and frequent in stating that 'Christ GAVE HIMSELF to redeem us from our iniquities'—that 'he gave himself a ransom for all'—that Christ loved the church, and GAVE HIMSELF for it.' This voluntary consent to the requirements of justice renders Christ's death properly vicarious, and acceptable in our behalf. As a holy being, he could not suffer unless as an atonement; and only as a voluntary sacrifice could there be virtue in his sufferings.

(*f*) The sacrifice of our High Priest was acceptable, because it was one of infinite dignity and glory. Whatever dignity there was connected with the Jewish high priests, it was official, not personal; it was extraneous, not natural. But the dignity of Christ is the reverse. It is personal and intrinsic. His glory is not derived; it is in himself. It is he who magnifies his office, and not his office which magnifies him. The glories of his throne are derived from his own natural and moral perfections; and all the high titles he bears, and all the honours with which he is invested, are but the symbols of his real excellence and glory. Possessing every attribute, assuming every title, and exercising every prerogative of Deity, he is appropriately designated 'the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person.' This glorious Being Incarnate was the victim for our transgressions, and the dignity of his nature gives an infinite virtue to his death. It renders him an Almighty Saviour, and proclaims him 'able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him.'

Against this doctrine it has been alleged that the Deity could not die. With equal truth may it be affirmed that *man* cannot die. The death of man does not mean the extinction of his soul's existence, nor even the suspension of his consciousness. It means merely that his body dies. Why

should the meaning of words be so plain and easily understood when applied to man, and yet be deemed so harsh and contradictory when applied in the same sense to our Lord's death? When we say that He died, we mean the same as when applied to human beings. We never mean that by Christ's death the Divinity ceased to exist, or became annihilated, or lost its consciousness, any more than we mean that a human soul becomes deprived of existence or consciousness when man dies. But if the phraseology be proper in its application to man, as a compound existence, so it is proper when applied to the complex nature of our Lord. Then let us not shrink from the language of Holy Scripture. He did die—truly and properly die—for the world's transgressions. He hath bought the Church with his own blood, and his dignity and glory—his personal and moral excellencies as God, as well as man—have impressed his atonement with a virtue adequate to all which the guilt of perishing millions required, and Divine justice demanded in our behalf.

(*g*) Our great High Priest died with the special intention of atoning for sin. There is properly much importance attached to the intention of a deed. Amongst all intelligent beings, the motive or intention contributes more to the character or complexion of an action than the nature of the action itself. It is, therefore, important in our argument to ascertain the intention which pervaded the mind of our Saviour in his sufferings. This must be gathered from the Scriptures—from the statements he uttered himself on the subject, and from what his prophets and apostles have declared under the inspiration of his Holy Spirit. Was the object of his death that of a martyr, to seal the truths of his mission with his blood? No; for the *miracles* he performed were proofs of the Divinity of his mission, and of the truth of his doctrine. The works that he did bore witness of him that the Father had sent him. And if any further proof had been necessary, it would have been better afforded by his publicly ascending to heaven in triumph than by his dying between two thieves upon the cross. Was the object of his death to present to his followers a perfect example of resignation and obedience, even amid the extremities of a violent and awful death? Undoubtedly this was *an* object of his death, but not *the* object which he had in view. It was only a part, and a very sub-

ordinate and inferior part, of the design he proposed to accomplish. The Scriptures nowhere state this as the chief object; on the contrary, they emphatically state that he died as a *propitiation*, not as a martyr; as a sacrifice—not merely or chiefly as an example. If the design of the Saviour's death be typically set forth by the victims offered under the law, as we have shown it is, it follows that this design was to *atone* for the sins of mankind. To *atone*, to *ransom*, to *deliver from death*, to turn aside *Divine displeasure*, is constantly stated as the object of the victims presented by the Jewish high priests, as we have clearly proved already. Then such was the design of Christ in his death. This our Lord himself clearly states. 'I give my flesh for the life of the world.' 'The Son of man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister; and to give his life a ransom for many.'

This was the chief object of his priestly office—the special design of his sacrificial death. This intention pervaded the mind of the Saviour in all he did and suffered in our behalf. This intention on the part of Christ, in offering his precious life, was reciprocated on the part of the Father in accepting that offering; for the same passage which tells us that Christ was wounded for our transgressions, declares that 'it pleased the Lord to bruise him; HE hath put him to grief'—that He made his soul an offering for sin. This union of purpose and object between Christ and the Father is clearly and impressively exhibited in the exclamations of the Saviour amid the intense and awful agonies of his passion. 'The cup which my Father hath given me to drink, shall I not drink it?' 'Father, thy will be done.'

For the reasons now stated, the sacrifice of our glorious High Priest was complete, and perfectly available as an atonement for sin. It was the sacrifice of spotless holiness united with infinite dignity. It was an offering voluntarily presented, and presented for the definite purpose of making propitiation for the sins of the world. It was, therefore, an offering in righteousness—the odour of a sweet smell; a sacrifice well-pleasing to God. Through it the law was vindicated, justice honoured, mercy revered, and salvation procured for all men. Therefore this sacrifice required no repetition. Our Lord had no need to offer himself *often*, as the Jewish high priests, daily

ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices. 'But now ONCE in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.' 'By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.' The deed once done, its efficacy remains for ever.

(*h*) While the qualifications of our High Priest show the perfection and sufficiency of his sacrifice, striking facts have *proved*, beyond all doubt, that it is accepted in our behalf. Under former dispensations there was some visible symbol of God's approval of the offerings presented. When Abel presented the firstlings of his flock, and Cain brought of the fruits of the earth, there was a visible manifestation of God's approval of the one, and his rejection of the other; and this was made obvious to both worshippers. God testified of Abel's gifts, and this testimony was visible; for when Cain saw it he was very wroth, and his countenance fell. When Noah, Abraham, and other patriarchs offered acceptably to God, there was some sensible manifestation of God's approval. When the priests presented their sacrifices to God at the erection of the tabernacle, 'the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people; and there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat: which when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces.'—Lev. ix. 23, 24. When David offered sacrifice at the threshing-floor of Ornan, God answered him from heaven by fire.—1 Chron. xxi. 26. When the Temple was dedicated by sacrifice and prayer, 'the fire came down from heaven, and consumed the burnt-offering and the sacrifices; and the glory of the Lord filled the house.'—2 Chron. vii. 1. So, when Elijah offered sacrifice at Mount Carmel, the fire fell from heaven and consumed the sacrifice.* These manifestations of Divine approval were necessary under that dispensation; but how much more necessary that the sacrifice of the great atonement offered by our High Priest, for the world's salvation, should receive some visible and indubitable evidence of its acceptance! It was necessary to the honour of the victim. It was necessary to confront and confound our spiritual adversaries. It was necessary to silence our fears—to banish the last lingering doubt from our minds,

* See the Author's work on 'The Shekinah; or, The Manifestation of Jehovah under all Dispensations.'

nd enable us to rejoice in the perfect security of our souls, vhile we trust in the merits of the atoning Lamb. God has graciously given us this evidence, especially in two miraculous events—the rending of the vail of the Temple, and the resurrection of our blessed Lord.

The vail of the Temple was a screen, or curtain, formed of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, richly embroidered with cherubim. It was hung across the interior of the Temple, o divide it into two apartments—the one called the holy place, vhere the priests daily ministered; the other, the most holy, vhere was the mercy-seat, and the Shekinah, or cloud of glory, resting between the cherubim; and where the high priest alone entered, and he only once a year, and then not without blood. The sacred vail was a type of the Redeemer's flesh. While that ail was whole, the interior glory was hidden from human bservation. While that vail was whole, it was an evidence hat the Jewish dispensation was in force—that the great acrifice had not been rendered. While that vail was whole, he Holy Ghost signified that the way to the holiest of all vas not yet made manifest. But when that vail was rent, it ndicated the contrary facts. The vail was rent in twain when he body of Christ was rent in the agonies of death—at the noment the great sacrifice was completed. Jesus bowed his ead, and cried, 'It is finished,' and gave up the ghost; 'and, ehold, the vail of the temple was rent in twain, from the top o the bottom.' Three evangelists record this event, and they re minute in remarking its coincidence with the moment of ne Redeemer's death. But why this coincidence? Why nould violence be done to this mysterious vail at the instant nat the Saviour expired? Why was it not rent at the time f his birth, or of his temptation, or during some period in his inistry? Because then the atonement was not made. Why as not the vail rent when he was agonizing in the garden, or at ne moment when he was hung upon the cross? Because then ne atonement, though commenced, was not completed. But hen he bowed his head, exclaiming, 'It is finished'—when he osed his eyes in death, and gave up the ghost—then the work as done; and that moment the invisible hand of Jehovah rent ne mystic vail asunder, and the trembling priest saw the interior glories of the holiest of all suddenly thrown open to his

gaze. The atonement explains the reason. The death of our Lord had accomplished the object designed. It fulfilled the demands of the moral law, and therefore it answered the design of the ceremonial law. It satisfied the requirements of justice, and therefore fulfilled the purposes of mercy. The Father could not but accept it, for it was all-sufficient; and his acceptance was indicated by his unseen hand rending asunder the vail of the Temple, from the top to the bottom. However sacred before, the vail is common now. Its use is at an end. The way to the holiest of all is made plain. The obligations of the typical economy are abrogated. The fires on the altar may now be extinguished; the victims may cease to bleed: Aaron and his sons may fold up their robes, and retire from the sanctuary; for their work is done. The rending of the vail at the precise instant of the Saviour's death, at once connects the type with the antitype, and proclaims the sufficiency and Divine acceptance of the sacrifice of Jesus, the High Priest of our profession.

The resurrection of the Saviour is another and a still more public demonstration of the same important fact. Had his sacrifice been faulty or inadequate, his body could never have risen from the grave. The holy and inflexible law would have detained it in the tomb. The tidings of his resurrection would never have been published, and our hopes of salvation must have been entombed for ever in the gloomy sepulchre. But he is not there; he is risen. On the morning of the third day, ere the sun arose, our Lord had risen, and burst the barriers of death. The seal parted, the stone retired, and the veteran guard fled in consternation before the brightness of Christ's rising majesty; and he went forth a mighty conqueror, trampling on death and hell. His resurrection proclaims him a perfect Saviour, and attests the acceptance of his death. His acceptance necessarily implies the perfection of his atonement, and his resurrection as necessarily implies both, as the effect follows the cause. When it is daylight, we know the sun is risen; so, by the resurrection of the Saviour, we know that his work is accepted in our behalf. It is the broad seal of the Father upon the character he sustained, upon the work he performed, and upon the sacrifice he presented, in our behalf.

This fact accounts for the importance which the apostles niformly attached to the resurrection of Christ, and the equency with which they proclaimed that event. St Paul ays, 'If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in our sins.' But why yet in their sins? They had practically rsaken their sins. They had ceased to do evil, and learned do well. If men are saved merely by their repentance, they ere entitled to salvation, for they had repented. If men are ved by a return to obedience, they were entitled to salvation, r they had returned to obedience. If men are saved by faith, ey were entitled to salvation, for they had believed. If men e saved when repentance, obedience, and faith are all con- ined, they were entitled to salvation, for all the three were emplified in them, as the Apostle states. Yet he says their ith was vain, and they were yet in their sins, unless Christ d risen! How, then, could it be said that they were yet in eir sins if Christ was not raised? The atonement explains

The death of Christ was professedly and ostensibly a *crifice* for our guilt, and the resurrection a *demonstration* of acceptance. But if Christ be not raised, then there is no oof of its acceptance; and if no proof of its acceptance, it s inadequate; and if inadequate, there is no atonement for ; and if there be no atonement for us, our confidence is mis- ced, our tears of repentance are in vain, and our obedience effectual. We are yet in our sins—unpardoned, and utterly thout hope of mercy. But if Christ be raised, the converse nsequences follow: Christ's death is accepted, and if accepted, nement is made; and if atonement is made and accepted, en is our confidence rightly placed, and we are saved. Assured, erefore, of Christ's resurrection, we are assured of his suffi- ncy. We know in whom we have trusted, and are persuaded t he is able to keep that which we have committed unto n against that day.

III. *Another important part of the Saviour's office as our gh Priest, and one essentially connected with his atonement, hat of making intercession.* After the Jewish high priest offered the atoning victim, he was required to enter once he year, on the great day of expiation, within the vail of most holy, there to make intercession for the people. In act he took part of the blood of the victim he had offered,

and sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat, overshadowed with the symbol of the Divine presence, and burnt incense before the Lord—the cloud of the incense covering the mercy-seat. While he was thus engaged, the people in the outer court were engaged in prayer. Thus their prayers, and the intercessory incense of the high priest, ascended together before God.—Lev. xvi. 12—14; Luke i. 9, 10. Jesus, our great High Priest, having finished his atonement, 'entered not the holy places made with hands, the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.'—Heb. ix. 24. 'Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.'—Heb. vii. 25.

But how does Christ intercede for us? Not, we presume, by vocal prayer, such as he offered in the days of his flesh, when he poured out his soul with strong crying and tears. There is no need for such a supposition, and the representations of Scripture do not favour this view. The intercession of the Jewish high priest consisted not in the use of words, but of certain appropriate actions. He *appeared* before God, presenting a portion of the blood which had been shed in sacrifice, and burning incense before the mercy-seat. So Christ *appears* in the presence of God for us. The appearance of the Redeemer's human nature in heaven, that nature which was crucified being now in the very brightness of the Divine presence, makes effectual intercession in our behalf. It is a sublime fact, full of interest and full of wonder. It is a profound and efficacious argument, pleading infinite reasons for mercy to the penitent, and grace for the believer. The blood of Abel, when shed by his brother's hand, was said to speak. A voice from heaven arrested the murderer, saying, 'The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground.' How did that blood cry? There was no sound emanating from the mangled corpse, or its congealed blood, as it lay upon the earth, yet there was an appeal which God could hear. In that murdered form there was an appeal to God, as the righteous governor of the world, requiring him to avenge the innocent sufferer. So the presence of Christ our High Priest speaks volumes of intercessory appeal in our behalf. The blood of Christ speaketh better things than the blood of Abel. The

ood of the martyr cried for vengeance, but the blood of the onement cries for mercy upon the sinner. It speaks that the crificial work is done, that the atonement has been made, at the covenant has been fulfilled, that the prophecy is accomished, that the law is honoured, that justice is satisfied, and an redeemed. Thus it appeals to God in man's behalf—it peals to his justice as well as his mercy, to his truth as well his compassion, requiring him to pardon the penitent, and stow the blessings of his grace upon each believing suppliant.

As the acceptance of our Lord's atonement has been deonstrated by striking facts, so has the prevalence of his tercession been made manifest, by the outpouring of the oly Ghost on the day of Pentecost. The Saviour, while on rth, promised the gift of the Holy Ghost to the Church, but was very express in connecting that gift with his intercesm. It could not be given before he had suffered death, nor fore he had entered into heaven. Let us attend to his own cious promise. 'I will pray the Father, and he shall give a another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; n the Spirit of truth.' 'But now I go my way to him that t me; and none of you asketh me, Whither goest thou? t because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath d your heart. Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is exient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him o you.'—John xiv. 16, 17; xvi. 5—7. Just before our d ascends to heaven, he adverts again to this promise, and s his disciples they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost many days hence; and he commands them to wait at usalem for its accomplishment. From these passages we that the *period when* the Holy Ghost should be given was ortant. It was expedient, first, that Christ should die; secondly, that he should go to the Father. Then, and till then, the Comforter should be given. We ask, Why was hus expedient? Why was it that the Holy Ghost could be given until our Lord had ascended to heaven? The ement unfolds the reason. The gift of the Holy Ghost designed to be a special demonstration of the prevalence of st's intercession, the first exhibition of its efficacy; but the rcession must *follow* the atonement. Under the law, the

high priest could never enter the holy of holies to intercede until the victim had been slain. So Christ, our great High Priest, could not enter the holy place not made with hands until his atonement had been offered and accepted. While, therefore, the resurrection proves the sufficiency and Divine acceptance of his atonement on the cross, the outpouring of the Holy Ghost demonstrates the prevalence and efficacy of his intercession before the throne.

It is also worthy of a passing remark, that there was a conjunction between the intercession of the Jewish high priest and the prayers of the people. The worshippers in the outer court were engaged in prayer, while the high priest was presenting the fragrant incense in the most holy place. We find the same union and coincidence in reference to the intercession of Christ and the prayers of the Church. When about to leave his disciples, he reminds them of his promise of the Holy Ghost, and in his last words commands them to return to Jerusalem, and continue in prayer until they are endued with the Spirit's power. Our great High Priest then ascends to the mediatorial throne to intercede, and the disciples return to Jerusalem for prayer. Thus, their prayers and the intercession of the Redeemer unite; they mingle with the holy incense, and then the promised blessing is bestowed. So soon as the prayers of the Church rise to their proper degree of fervour and faith, they are answered, and the Holy Ghost, the greatest blessing conferred on man, is bestowed. It is thus that the prayers of faith are always answered. The Angel of the covenant stands at the altar, having a golden censer: he has much incense, and he offers it with the prayers of saints upon the golden altar before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, with the prayers of saints, ascendeth before God, out of the Angel's hand.—Rev. viii. 3, 4.

The intercession of Christ is thus intimately and essentially connected with his atonement. Indeed, his intercession is the constant presentation before God of the efficacy of his atonement. It is the exhibition in his 'LIFE' of what he has accomplished by his death. He still appears as a sacrificial victim. The Lamb *stands* in the midst of the throne, but appears as it had been *slain*. Though alive, and exalted to the highest heavens, the marks of his death are obvious. His wounds seen

esh, and the worth, validity, and efficacy of his sufferings are e same now as at the moment of his death. He presents mself before the throne in our behalf. The existence of his orified human nature before the throne supplies permanent id availing reasons why the penitent should be pardoned, and e blessings of the covenant bestowed in answer to prayer. ence it is that the Apostle unites his death and his life gether as ministering to our salvation: 'For if, when we ere enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his n, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his FE;' for 'he ever LIVETH to make intercession for us.' hrough him, therefore, we have access to God, and can come th boldness unto the throne of grace, to obtain mercy, and d grace to help in time of need.' 'Having therefore boldness enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and ing way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the vail, at is to say, his flesh; and having a High Priest over the use of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full surance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil nscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.'—Heb. x. —22.

A few objections may be briefly noticed:—

1. To invalidate the argument founded upon the typical rifices of the law, it has been alleged that God merely erated these offerings, but had no pleasure in them. To tain this ridiculous notion we are referred to the passage of Psalmist, where he says, 'Thou desirest not sacrifice; else uld I give it.'—Ps. li. 16. We reply, there was here a cial case. David had been guilty of murder, for which no rifice was appointed. It was a sin not only against God, a capital crime against the civil law; and as it was not de- ned that the ceremonial law should frustrate the ends of l government, no sacrifice was appointed for murder. The must take its course. But the ordinary sacrifices *were* l-pleasing to God, when offered with suitable dispositions. y were of Divine appointment; and God is pleased with own appointments. David continued to offer them all his and prepared to build the temple where they were to be red in after ages. And it is worthy of notice, that *this very e Psalm* concludes with a recognition of sacrifices, the duty

of presenting them, and of the fact that God would be well pleased with them :—'Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion : build thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt-offering and whole burnt-offering : then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar.'—Ps. li. 18, 19.

We are referred, also, to the passage in Ps. xl. 6, where it is written, 'Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire ; mine ears hast thou opened : burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required ;' and this passage is adduced to show that sacrifices were not originally of God. We reply, the passage when read throughout proves just the reverse. The Psalmist is speaking in prophetic anticipation of the coming of Christ, and is adverting to the superior sacrifice which HE should offer. Hence, in the next verse, he represents Christ as saying, 'Then said I, Lo, I come : in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God.' But how did Christ do the will of his Father ? By drinking the bitter cup, and dying as a sacrifice for sin. The connection of Jewish sacrifices, in this passage, with the Saviour's death, clearly establishes their Divine origin and typical design, and thus overthrows the notion of the objector. Still the offerings under the law, though ordained of God, were so inferior to the great sacrifice of Christ, that he had no pleasure in them compared with his regard for the real propitiation of Christ. His having no pleasure in them, simply implies that he had a less regard for them. They were infinitely inferior in their nature, and therefore were held in inferior estimation. We love our earthly friends, but, says the Saviour, 'If a man hate not his father and mother, he cannot be my disciple.' But we know that his meaning is only that we must have a less degree of love for them than we have for God our Saviour, inducing us rather to give them up than sin against him. God approved of the Jewish sacrifices, but he had less regard for them than he had for the atonement of his own dear Son, and in the fulness of time he abrogated them, as no longer necessary.

There are several passages where God denounces the sacrifices of the Jews, and speaks of being weary of them.—Isa. i. 11—14 ; lxvi. 3. But all such denunciations and reprehensions are directed against the hypocrisy which makes external

eremonies a substitute for holy affections and practical obe-
ience. When the form of religion is substituted for the power,
nat form becomes itself an abomination to the Lord. It is
orthy of notice, that similar reprehensions are expressed
gainst their prayers. 'And when ye spread forth your hands,
will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many
rayers, I will not hear.' But why would he not hear them?
he answer is given—'Your hands are full of blood.'—Isa. i. 15.

All such sophisms, adduced to invalidate the argument
unded upon the nature and use of types, are pitiful in the
xtreme. That the institutions of the Mosaic law were ordained
pecially of God, is as clearly and fully taught as any truth in
vealed religion. There are a thousand proofs of it in the
ible. The whole Pentateuch attests it; and the entire phrase-
ogy of Scripture is based upon it. And that this ceremonial
stitution had a typical design is as clearly maintained. We
ve already shown that this is the distinct and emphatic de-
aration of Christ himself, and of the *Holy Ghost*, which testi-
s of Christ.

2. Against the atonement, it is objected that our salvation
described as being *a gift—a free gift*, and that as such it
nnot be consistent with satisfaction being made to Divine
stice. We reply, this objection rests upon a misapplication
the word '*free*.' The term *free* is applicable to the mode
its *bestowment*, not to the mode of its being *procured*. To
salvation is *given freely* in the strictest sense of the term;
we do not merit the blessing, nor give to God any equi-
lent for his favour. It is a perfect gratuity. But it was
tained *for us* at the price of the Saviour's blood; and it is
markable that the same passages which describe it as free in
bestowment connect it with the death of the Saviour as its
ice, or procuring cause. The Apostle says, 'the GIFT of God
eternal life,' but he adds, 'THROUGH our Lord Jesus Christ.'
e says, 'where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:
t as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign
rough righteousness unto eternal life:' but still he adds,
at this grace and eternal life are *by* our Lord Jesus Christ.
ain, he says we are 'justified *freely* by his grace,' but he
ls, '*through* the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom
d hath set forth to be a propitiation.' The whole phraseology

of the New Testament shows that every blessing we receive is given *through* our Lord Jesus Christ.

Nor is there any contradiction in the doctrine of salvation being a free gift, and yet procured by the Saviour's death. If we bestow a gift upon a fellow-creature, it is free to *him*, whatever it may have cost *ourselves*. It is because Christ has procured salvation for us that it is offered freely—that no price is required at our hand. 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.' Christ himself was given for us freely; and with him God will freely give us all things.

3. It is alleged that if our Lord made atonement for all, then absolutely all ought to be saved; but that as no one is saved except he forsake his sins, his salvation is through forsaking sin, and not through any atonement. This objection is grounded upon a misconception of the nature and object of the atonement, or it is a sophism devised upon a wilful perversion of the doctrine. Atonement saves men, not absolutely and irresistibly, but on conditions, and the conditions accord with God's holy government and man's needy circumstances. The atonement is such a satisfaction to Divine justice as renders it compatible with the righteousness of God to pardon the penitent, not the impenitent; and its design is to secure the sinner's holiness and obedience, as well as his pardon. In this sense, the atonement is for all. Man's rejection of its blessings proves only his own obstinacy; it does not invalidate the efficacy of the atoning victim. If a price be paid for a rebel's freedom on condition of his returning to his allegiance, and that rebel refuse to accept it on such conditions, his obstinacy and rebellion do not militate against the goodness of his deliverer, nor lessen the price paid for his redemption. The wretched being continues in his dungeon solely because he refuses the freedom offered to him. God makes provision for man's welfare in the economy of Providence; but then, men have to employ their own energies in the use of proper means, and without these means his bounty is exercised in vain. Christ has made provision for our salvation; but its blessings are tendered to us on the conditions of 'repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.' He is the Saviour of all men, but especially of them that believe. His

death hath placed *all* men in a salvable state, and procured for all the aid of the Holy Spirit; but such only can be *actually* saved as comply with Gospel requirements. Nor does this take off from the efficacy of Christ's death, but simply shows the righteous way in which his death can be made available to man. Christ has done that for us which we could never have done for ourselves. He has taken away the *legal barrier* to our pardon, and made it consistent with the claims of God's law, and honourable to God's character, to pardon sin. The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he hath magnified the law and made it honourable.

So far from the Gospel plan of mercy superseding man's obedience, it most effectually secures and promotes that obedience. St Paul, after clearly stating and elaborately proving that salvation is by faith in the atonement, anticipates the objection we have been refuting, and asks, 'Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.' The atonement upholds the claims of God's holy law—exhibits its sanctity—maintains its authority—enforces its precepts—and imperatively urges obedience to all its requirements. We see that law honoured when, to prevent its righteous claims being set at nought and despised, they are met by the sufferings and death of the innocent, the holy, the immaculate Lamb of God! We see that law honoured when man is presented with the most powerful motives and obligations to holiness and obedience! While the atonement inspires confidence, it checks presumption; while it removes guilt from the conscience, it quickens and instructs the conscience; while it cancels the sentence of death and the curse of the law, it inspires respect for all the obligations and requirements of the law; and while it exhibits God as a benevolent Father, it presents him before us also as a righteous magistrate of unspotted holiness and inflexible justice. It draws our affections towards him, but tempers our love by inspiring humility, reverence, and awe. It speaks to the conscience, and says, Be holy, for God is holy. It speaks to the affections, and says, Be loving, for God is love. It thus lays the true and only foundation for obedience; and inspires in man's bosom the highest motives to gratitude, to reverence, to obedience, to holiness, to his keeping all the commandments of God.

While the atonement thus draws forth man's affections to

the Deity, and prompts him to all holy obedience, it excludes even the occasion of boasting. It makes man feel his guilt, his wretchedness, his helplessness, and his dependence upon Christ. It gives the whole glory to the Saviour; and places man in his right position at the feet of Jesus. It strips him of all self-righteousness, stops the mouth of the proud Pharisee, and asks, Where is boasting? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay; but by the law of faith; and that faith is in the blood which propitiates. To man it secures all the benefit —to God it ascribes all the praise.

4. It is further objected that the atonement is repugnant to the benevolent character of God. To this we reply, that the atonement is not only in harmony with God's benevolence, but even necessary to its exhibition in the recovery of man. God is love; but his love is never exercised capriciously or at random: never without a definite object, never but in perfect consistency and harmony with all his other attributes. Indeed, it does not appear that any of God's attributes are exerted separately, or one without the other, much less one in opposition to another. God is omnipotent—he has power to do all things; but that power is never exerted capriciously, creating or destroying without reference to wisdom, love, justice, and holiness. His power is always directed by wisdom. It is, indeed, the agent of all his attributes—it is the energy by which they are exerted and displayed. So love, as a disposition or affection in the Deity, is, like power, always directed by wisdom, truth, and holiness. Love in man may, like any other passion, be irregular or misplaced. It may be controlled by ignorance, and exercised at the expense of justice and virtue. And thus a noble passion may degenerate into a depraved sentiment. But never so in God. It is always pure, holy, wise, in harmony with all his attributes, and cannot be otherwise.

The theory which denies the atonement contradicts the nature of God. It argues for the display of love at the expense of justice. It sets aside the claims of rectitude. The Scripture doctrine of the atonement exhibits both his love and his justice, his truth and holiness, in harmony. The atonement does not imply that God delights in the sufferings of any, but in the salvation and happiness of man. The cause which required the atonement exists in the evil of sin, not in any implacable dis-

position in the bosom of Deity. It was his love for man, joined with his aversion to sin, which rendered the atonement necessary. As Richard Watson has well observed—'The reasons which compel him to maintain his authority do not terminate in himself. If he treats offenders with severity, it is for our sake, and for the sake of the moral order of the universe, to which sin, if encouraged by a negligent administration, would be the source of endless disorder and misery. And if the granting of pardon should be strongly and even severely guarded, so that no less a satisfaction could be accepted than the death of God's own Son, we are to refer this, as the Apostle Paul does, to the *moral necessity of the case*, arising out of the claims of the law, and the general welfare of accountable creatures, liable to the deep evil of sin; and not to any reluctance on the part of our Maker to forgive—much less to anything vindictive in his nature.' It was because God is love—boundless love; and because God is just—inflexibly just; because he is at once our Father, and the Governor of the universe, that an atonement was required and made for mankind. And this, so far from impugning the Divine character, exhibits it in the fairest and the brightest lustre. It declares his righteousness, and it declares his mercy too. In fact, redemption is a mirror which exhibits the Divine perfections to the human understanding in the most pure and perfect effulgence; for it shows us God in the face of Jesus Christ; and his face is the only medium in which we can behold God's character aright. If we behold the Divine character through the medium of Nature, that medium is obscure, and the image becomes distorted. If we look at him through the law, we behold him surrounded with the blackness and the lightnings of Sinai, clothed in majesty so terrible that we turn pale with consternation, and flee in dismay from the spectacle. But if we look at him through the medium of the atonement, we behold his character bright and full-orbed. We behold him as he is. We see wisdom, power, compassion, justice, and mercy, blending their rays like the colours of the rainbow, and exhibiting the Divine character in the brightest lustre and the most perfect excellence. Here it is that mercy and truth meet together, and righteousness and peace kiss each other.

From several intimations in the Scriptures, it appears, that

while the atonement saves men from eternal wrath, restores them to God, and gives them the most clear and sublime views of the Divine character, it is designed also to present to other orders of intelligent beings such a development of the Divine perfections as can be obtained from no other source. That the angels are filled with solemn and delightful interest in contemplating the wonders of redemption by the death of Christ, is expressly stated by the Apostle Peter, who, after referring to the 'sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow,' says, 'which things the angels desire to look into.'—1 Peter i. 12. As the cherubim bent over the mercy-seat in the attitude of pondering its mysteries, so the angels are intensely interested in profound and delightful contemplation of God's redeeming love by the cross of Christ. That they regard it as the brightest manifestation of the Divine character with which their exalted minds are acquainted is evident from their song at the Saviour's birth—'GLORY TO GOD IN THE HIGHEST.' That it is the design of God to make the history of redemption a means of unfolding his perfections to angels, is manifest from the language of St Paul: 'To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God.' These *principalities* and *powers* are properly regarded as terms designating the different orders of angelic beings; and to these God designed to unfold his glory by what he has done in the redemption of man. That the atonement not only instructs the angels, but also promotes the happiness of angels, is manifest from the anthems they sing in celebration of the atonement. They unite with the glorified in songs of exultation. They make salvation by the blood of Christ the theme of their rejoicing. 'And, behold, I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the living ones and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the LAMB THAT WAS SLAIN, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.' The angels are not, indeed, redeemed by Christ; they do not need redemption. But though not redeemed, they are benefited. They are holy beings, and they rejoice that God is glorified. They are benevolent beings, and they rejoice that man is saved and made happy. They are intelli-

gent beings, and their minds are capable of expansion, refinement, and elevation; and the atonement is the means appointed for promoting their elevation in knowledge and enjoyment. They are influenced by moral motives, and the wonders exhibited in the condescension and love of Christ in his incarnation, death, and resurrection; and the display thus given of the Divine glory presents to their minds fresh motives to love God and continue in fidelity and obedience. The effects of the atonement will never cease; and as they stretch through all eternity, so they may extend through all immensity. They may extend to all *orders*, as well as be continued through all *ages*. The atonement may be to the universe of mind what gravitation is to the universe of matter. God works by the simplest means. His laws in Nature are of universal application, and so the principles of the Divine character and government evolved by the cross of Christ may bear upon all intelligent beings, and affect the moral history of the whole universe. The transactions of redemption which have occurred on the diminutive platform of this revolted planet may be promotive of the moral order, harmony, and happiness of the universe throughout eternity.

In reference to man, how adapted the atonement to his condition! It meets all his necessities. It revokes every curse incurred. It restores every blessing forfeited, or gives man in exchange a more glorious inheritance. It places before him a definite object of confidence, and supplies reasons for his trust such as may well banish every doubt from his mind. Its adaptation has been shown in all ages, and in instances innumerable. Its witnesses are myriads. Human beings of every clime, and characters of every grade, have proved its efficacy. None are too vile for Jesus to save. 'His blood cleanseth from all sin.' It has atoned for all; and when applied by faith it cleanses all. God's blessing has ever attended this doctrine. Religion never spread where it was denied. A mission never prospered, a revival never occurred, and a reformation was never affected, where this doctrine was rejected. The Spirit and the blood are essentially united. They bear witness together. The former was never given where the latter was rejected. Without this doctrine there is no efficacy in prayer, no access to the throne of grace, no power with God, no Divine

influence, no vital religion. He who rejects this doctrine, rejects the only means of salvation which God has provided for mankind. His confidence is presumption, his hopes are fallacious, and his piety is nominal. Like Cain's sacrifice, his offering is unauthorized; it has no odour and can find no acceptance; and both himself and his offering will be rejected.

Reader, be not wise above what is written. I beseech thee, let not pride of intellect or self-sufficiency hinder thee from salvation. Submit to be saved in God's own way. Thankfully acquiesce in God's revealed method of forgiveness. Receive Christ as the Saviour as well as the Messiah. Trust in him as thy great High Priest, and thou wilt find a present pardon; and, proving faithful to Divine grace, thy voice shall finally mingle in sweet and eternal harmony with the anthems of those around the throne, who celebrate the efficacy of the Redeemer's atoning blood.

CHAPTER IX.

ELECTION AND REPROBATION.

Having explained the nature and established the truth of the atonement, we have next to consider its extent; and in connection with this subject the doctrines of Election and Reprobation have to be examined.

It is especially necessary to discourse upon such a subject on the apostolic principle of '*speaking the truth in love.*' Many men of distinguished talent, piety, and usefulness, have held views opposite to our own on this doctrine; and many of our pious and gifted contemporaries still hold them. We must, therefore, give them credit for that sincerity we claim for ourselves, and carefully avoid the employment of a word calculated to misrepresent the views or irritate the feelings of our brethren in Christ. An argument conducted in this spirit will claim their candid attention, and be freely considered on each side, without interfering for one moment with the high claims of Christian kindness and affection.

In the standard authorities and works acknowledged by

some Christians, it is maintained that God, from all eternity, has absolutely decreed a certain number of persons to be saved; and that for these the Saviour died, and for none else. These persons are termed 'The chosen—the elect of God.' But the rest of mankind, it is maintained, were, from all eternity, predestinated to everlasting wrath and misery. That we may not be supposed to misrepresent the case, we shall at once appeal to standard authorities:—

The Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms furnish, in general, an excellent compendium of the principles of the Christian religion; but their worth and usefulness are seriously deteriorated, we conceive, by the Calvinistic doctrines of Election and Reprobation, which limit the extent of the atonement, and thus impugn the justice and benevolence of God. In the third chapter of the Confession we have the following declarations—'By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be increased or diminished. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature as conditions or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore, they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ; are effectually called unto faith in Christ, by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power, through faith, unto salvation. *Neither are any other redeemed by Christ*, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, *but the elect only*. The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth for the glory

of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice.'

It is here maintained, as plainly as language can express it, that a certain definite number, called the elect, are absolutely predestinated to eternal life; that for these, and for these only, the Son of God has made atonement, and procured the means of salvation; that the rest of mankind are left without a Saviour, without mercy, and are absolutely preordained to eternal condemnation; that the former cannot be lost, for God has decreed they shall be saved; and the latter cannot be saved, because God has decreed they shall be lost; the everlasting destinies of each class being fixed, irrevocably fixed, by the eternal and immutable decree of God!

Calvin, in the Third Book of his 'Institutes,' dwells at length upon the subjects of Election and Reprobation, and gives his sentiments without the least reserve. In c. 21, s. 5, he states—'Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, by which he hath determined in himself what he would have to become of every individual of mankind—for they are not all created with similar destiny; but eternal life is foreordained for some, and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one or other of these ends, we say he is predestinated either to life or death.' In c. 23, Calvin further remarks—'Many indeed, as if they wished to avert odium from God, admit election in such a way as to deny that any one is reprobated. But this is puerile and absurd—because election itself could not exist without being opposed to reprobation; whom God passes by he therefore reprobates—and from no other cause than his determination to exclude them from the inheritance which he predestines for his children.' These statements are too plain to need any comment. No language can more explicitly teach the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation. The same sentiments are maintained in the sixth article of the synod of Dort, 1619, as the following extract will show:—'That some, in time, have faith given them by God, and others have it not given, proceeds from his eternal decree—'for known unto God are all his works, from the beginning of the world.' According to which decree, he gradually softens the hearts of the elect, however hard, and

e bends them to believe; but the non-elect he leaves, in just
idgment, to their own perversity and hardness.' In the con-
essions of the French Reformed Churches, 1558, and of the
Churches of Piedmont, in 1655, the same doctrines are main-
ained; a definite number are declared to be elected to eternal
alvation, and the rest of mankind are reprobated and predes-
inated to eternal destruction.

According to the theory now before us, even infants are
ubjects of election and reprobation. In chap. iii. sect. 3,
f the Westminster Confession, it is stated—'Elect infants,
ying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through
he Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth.'
f some infants be elected, it necessarily follows that the rest
re reprobated; for it is asserted that Christ died for none but
e elect. All infants, therefore, but the elect, are predestinated
eternal ruin. However repulsive the conclusion, it is an
ssential part of the doctrine under consideration. Calvin
enly vindicates the doctrine, and asks—'Whence comes it
pass that the fall of Adam should involve so many nations,
ogether with their infant children, in eternal death, without
medy, unless God saw it right that it should be so?' These
e the doctrines we reject; and, in opposition to them, we
aintain,

I. That Christ has made atonement for all mankind; and
at, consequently, there is no decree predestinating any
rson to eternal misery. We also maintain,

II. That, though Christ died for all, no part of mankind are
allibly and absolutely elected to everlasting life, but that
ry one's salvation depends, in a subordinate sense, upon his
n choice and conduct.

As we know nothing on these important subjects but what
d has been pleased to reveal in his word, it is to the Holy
iptures alone that we appeal for a decision on the questions
ssue. Our inquiry must, therefore, be, not what saith such
eminent divine, or such a convocation of men, however pious
learned, but what saith the Lord? 'To the law and to the
timony: if we speak not according to this word, it is because
re is no light in us.' Our Calvinistic brethren agree with
n this—they, as well as ourselves, acknowledge the Divine
infallible authority of the Holy Scriptures—and here we

meet on common ground. Let us, then, at once test our propositions by the standard of unerring truth.

In opposition to the theory that would limit the extent of Christ's atonement to a favoured portion of the human family, and shut out the rest, as doomed to eternal death, we maintain that Christ died for all, and has placed all men in a salvable state; and in support of our first proposition, we affirm that there is not *one* passage in the Scriptures which limits the efficacy of the atonement to any select number of the human family. Not one which declares that the Son of God died only for a few; not one which says that he did not die for all—for the world—the whole world—for every member of the family of man. And further, there is not one text of Scripture which either teaches this doctrine in plain language, or which obscurely implies it; and not one from which the doctrine can be inferred. This is an important fact, and should be kept steadily in view; for, if the doctrine be not in the Scriptures, it is not revealed; and if not revealed, it is a human invention.

But the doctrine of eternal reprobation is not only *without* proof, it is abundantly *disproved* by the Holy Scriptures; it is contradicted and overthrown by many of the plainest passages which establish the opposite doctrine—the great truth that Christ died for all men. These passages may, for the sake of convenience, be distributed into several classes:—

1. One numerous class of texts declares that Christ died for *the whole world.* John the Baptist, the herald of our Lord, the special messenger sent to prepare his way and proclaim his appearing, in directing his disciples to Jesus, as the true Messiah and the Saviour of men, exclaims—'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.'—John i. 29. The Apostle John avers the same truth—'And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.'—1 John iv. 14. Our Lord himself proclaims the fulness and freeness of the Father's love, and the universal extent of the blessings it designed for the human race—'For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'—John iii. 16. In order to limit the application of this passage to the elect, it is asserted, that by the world is meant the 'elect world.' But we reply: There is no passage

In Scripture containing any such phrase as the 'elect world.' Nor can the proposed restriction be supported by the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers, as there is no such phrase in the whole Bible; nor can the restriction be admitted by any just rule of interpretation. Besides, to say that the elect world is here meant, is not merely to force upon the passage a meaning foreign to its obvious import, but to deprive it of all meaning, and cause it to speak an absurdity; for, if Christ was given only for the elect world, all of whom, according to the Calvinistic theory, are absolutely ordained to eternal life, we may ask, Who are they described as in danger of perishing eternally through unbelief? If we place the passage before us in the Calvinistic costume, it would read thus—'For God so loved the elect world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever of the elect world believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life!' Who does not see that this would be a caricature of the language of inspired wisdom? Besides, the term '*world*,' though often applied either to the whole population of the globe, or to an indiscriminate mass of human beings, is never applied to the elect, or to the true people of God. On the contrary, they are always distinguished from the 'world,' and called by a different appellation. Hence our Lord's observation to his disciples: 'Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world; therefore the world hateth you.' The world, therefore, which God loved, and for the salvation of which he gave his Son, is the entire mass of human beings; and, if additional confirmation were wanting, we have it in the following passage, where the church and the world also—the whole world—as distinct from the church, are *both* described as the objects for whom the Redeemer died: 'And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only (as the church), but also for the sins of the whole world.'—1 John ii. 2.

2. There is another class of passages, in which Christ is declared to have died for *all* men, and for *every* man: 'For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all (not a part, but for all), to be testified in due time.'—1 Tim. ii. 6. Speaking again of Christ, St Paul says, that he humbled himself to be lower than the angels, for the suffering of death,

'that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.' —Heb. ii. 9. 'All men' and 'every man,' in these passages, must obviously include the whole human race.

3. A third class of passages declare, that the efficacy of Christ's death, and the ruinous effects of the fall, *are equal in extent*. St Paul states, that 'where sin abounded, grace did much more abound'—Rom. v. 20; and in establishing this great truth, he observes, 'But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.'—Rom. v. 15. The Greek words are *the many*,* that is *all*, were dead in trespasses and sin; and, unto *the many*, that is, *all*, the gift of grace hath abounded. Hence, in the following verse, he further states, 'Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.'—Rom. v. 18. Thus, it is taught, that the remedy provided by grace is co-extensive with the malady inflicted by sin. This doctrine runs through the whole Scriptures; and to quote all the passages in point we must transcribe a great portion of the Bible; but we select only one passage more under this head: 'For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.'—2 Cor. v. 14, 15. From this passage the universal extent of the atonement is taken for granted by the Apostle, as a truth which no one doubted; and from this established and universally admitted doctrine he deduces another, in order to commend the state of the world to the commiseration of Christians—namely, that all men were in a state of spiritual death. Christ died for all, is the doctrine admitted; therefore, all were dead, is the doctrine inferred. The truth, then, which Calvinistic divines deny, is one which the Apostle took for granted; and one so universally admitted by the primitive churches, that the attempt to prove it was evidently deemed unnecessary.

* That the Greek words οἱ πολλοὶ *the many*, have here the sense of πάντες, all, is manifest from the eighteenth verse, where the latter is used in reference to the same characters and the same facts.

4. The resurrection of *all* men is ascribed to the undertaking of Christ, and is therefore a proof that he died and rose again for *all*. Temporal death is one of the effects of sin; for 'by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.'—Rom. v. 12. So, the resurrection of men is the result of Christ's redemption; for it is declared as 'by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.'—1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. Since, then, a resurrection is purchased for all, and the death of Christ is the *only* procuring cause of any blessing for mankind, it necessarily follows that he died for all. That the resurrection of the finally impenitent will prove a curse and not a blessing, is no valid objection; as it is the fault of man, and not the design of our gracious Redeemer. The fact which we have to do with here is this, that as *all* men are destined to rise from the dead, and as no man can rise again but through the sacrifice of Christ, it necessarily follows that he died for all.

5. There is another class of passages which teach that the Saviour died even for *them that perish*. St Paul, enforcing the duty of exercising Christian charity, in accommodating ourselves to the scruples of a weak brother, exhorts—'Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died.'—Rom. xiv. 15. Enjoining the same duty upon the Corinthian church, and showing the awful result of disregarding it, he says—'And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?'—1 Cor. viii. 11. If our Lord died for those who perish, as well as for those who are saved, the conclusion is inevitable, that he died for all men. St Peter describes certain false teachers who shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and thereby bring upon themselves swift destruction.—2 Peter ii. 1. From these and similar passages, it is evident that Christ died for others besides the elect, or those who are said to be chosen to eternal life; yea, for those who perish eternally, whose damnable heresies bring upon themselves everlasting misery. This fact is fatal to the Calvinistic theory, and proves that Christ died for all human beings, whether they are eternally saved or eternally lost.

From what has been advanced, we clearly see that the doctrine which limits the extent of the atonement of Christ is unworthy of our belief, for it is not supported by a single passage in the Bible, but stands in palpable opposition to the plainest declarations of Scripture. Therefore, that Christ died for a few, or any limited portion of the human family, is the doctrine of men; that Christ died for the whole world, for all men, for every man, and even for them that perish, is the doctrine of the Bible. This fact being established, a number of important consequences follow:—

1. It follows that a decree of reprobation, absolutely predestinating any human being to eternal damnation, is impossible. If God gave his Son for all men, then he is moved with pity and compassion towards all men, and desires the salvation of all; for the originating cause of this gift was his unbounded love, and the intention of the gift is the salvation of men. 'For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.'—John iii. 17. Whom, therefore, he loved and desired to save, he could never pre-ordain to destroy.

2. If Christ died for all men, then are all placed in a salvable state. Not only are they free from any necessitating and fatal decree, but the privileges of a full and free salvation are procured for them. The sins of every man are atoned for, a pardon for every man is purchased, and every man is welcome to the favour of God and everlasting life. All the blessings he purchased for any man, he purchased for every man; and as the Redeemer died to procure for every sinner a throne and a crown in heaven, it is obvious no man could be under any previous decree consigning him to hell.

3. It follows that a measure of the Holy Spirit's influence is bestowed upon all men. The Spirit's influence flows from the atonement, and is as necessary to renew the depraved heart as the death of Christ is to atone for our guilt; and, as the provisions of grace are declared to be coextensive with the malady of sin, it is thereby implied that the operations of the Spirit, so far as necessary to salvation, are given to every man. It is thus that Christ is declared to be the Light of the world, 'the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.'—John i. 9. Some who contend for the universal

extent of the atonement, deny the universal influence of the Holy Spirit; but here they involve themselves in inconsistency and contradiction. For, since the influence of the Spirit proceeds from the atonement, it must be co-extensive with the efficacy of the atonement. Therefore, to confine the influence of the Spirit to a limited number of human beings, is to limit the atonement likewise: on the other hand, to admit the universality of the atonement, is to admit the universality of the Holy Spirit's influence.

4. In harmony with the doctrine that Christ died for all men, the duty to believe in him as a Saviour is enjoined upon all. The Redeemer himself declares, 'He that believeth shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.'—Mark xvi. 16. Under the New Testament dispensation, unbelief, or rejection of Christ, is rendered the highest crime of which men can be guilty. Men are threatened with eternal wrath, not so much because they have broken the moral law, as because they refuse to believe in Christ—because they will not receive him as their Saviour. Hence, it is again declared, 'He that believeth is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.'—John iii. 18. Here the duty is made *universal;* but if the atonement had been *partial*, the requirement to believe could not be *universal* without the most obvious injustice. If a great portion of mankind are reprobated, to command them to believe in Christ as their Saviour, is to command them to believe a lie; for Christ never died for them. It is, moreover, to require them to do that which God himself has rendered absolutely impossible; for if God has decreed their eternal destruction, it is plainly impossible for them to believe unto salvation. To complete the hardship and injustice of their case, they are condemned *especially* for not believing; and the only beings to be finally and eternally condemned for not believing in Christ as a Saviour, are those for whom a Saviour was never provided; whose faith in him is absolutely impossible; and whose faith, if possible, would be giving credit to a lie, and realizing a delusion!

5. While this theory is totally opposed to Scripture, it casts a tremendous libel upon the character of a wise, holy, and benevolent God; and renders the condition of men im-

measurably worse than that of the fallen angels. Devils, it is true, like the supposed reprobate, are beyond the reach of hope and mercy. But they are not deluded with offers of grace never to be realized, nor made responsible for the rejection of a Saviour whom they cannot receive. Devils are left, it is true, to the consequences of their fall; but their doom is not aggravated by additional woes, resulting from a fictitious and partial dispensation, which enjoins requirements impossible to be performed, and proclaims nothing but curses it is impossible to avoid. We have adverted to the reprobation of infants as shocking both to our judgment and our feelings. The helplessness and innocence of the babe, contrasted with the awful severity of its doom and the arbitrary decree that consigns it to eternal woe, fill us with compassion and horror. But the state of infants consigned from their mothers' womb to perdition, is a mild and merciful appointment compared with that of adults. Cut off in infancy, though earlier sent to the burning lake, they are saved from those fiercer flames which a life of unavoidable sin and unbelief would have inevitably made their eternal portion. Existence, however brief, is a frightful curse to the non-elect; but every day added to life serves only to swell the torrents of anguish that await them in hell. Such are the necessary consequences of a system that enjoins upon men the duty of believing in a Saviour who has done nothing for them. If these consequences are repulsive to reason and common sense, as they cannot but be, let the system which originates them be rejected as absurd, and injurious to the character of God. But, admitting what the Scriptures abundantly prove, that an atonement has been made for all—that all are placed in a salvable state—the duty of believing in Christ and receiving him is reasonable and obligatory. Where a blessing is universally offered, and attainable, there is a universal duty and responsibility. Privilege and accountability have both an inseparable connection, and a corresponding ratio; for God requireth from a man according to that which he hath, and not according to that which he hath not. When men are favoured with such rich provision as that contained in the Gospel—when Christ has died to save them—the guilt of wilfully rejecting him becomes a sin of tremendous magnitude, involving so much ingratitude and contempt of God, that it may

well be characterized as man's capital offence, and assigned as the chief cause of his eternal condemnation and punishment.

6. In harmony with the *universal* satisfaction of the Redeemer's death, and the consequent provision for the recovery of all men, we find the ambassadors of divine mercy are invested with a universal commission, and all the invitations and promises of grace hold forth a free and universal salvation. 'Go,' said our blessed Lord to his apostles, 'Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature'—not to some select and definite few, but to *every* creature. Publish to *all* men the glad tidings of salvation. In calling sinners to repentance, and inviting the penitent to his mercy, the same unlimited grace is manifested—'And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.'—Rev. xxii. 17. 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest; and him that cometh nnto me, I will in no wise cast out.'—Matt. xi. 28. On the principle of a free and general salvation, these gracious invitations have beauty and harmony; admit a limited atonement, and they are unintelligible and contradictory.

7. Agreeably with the doctrine of Universal Redemption, we find the Sacred Scriptures abounding with God's declarations of compassion for all men, of his desire for the salvation of all men, and his most tender expostulations with the rebellious and unbelieving. 'The Lord is gracious, and full of compassion; slow to anger, and of great mercy. The Lord is good to all: and his tender mercies are over all his works.'—Ps. cxlv. 8, 9. 'Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.'—Isa. i. 18. 'Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon. For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.'—Isa. lv. 7—9. He 'will have all men to be saved, and to

come unto the knowledge of the truth.'—1 Tim. ii. 4. On the ground that Christ has purchased salvation for all men, these tender expostulations are consistent and fraught with the richest mercy and truth; but on the Calvinistic theory, they are not true, and are calculated only to mock and deceive. The language of Calvin, indeed, does ascribe to God's calls and promises, equivocation and duplicity. He says—'God hath two wills, the one outward and revealed, whereby he doth most sweetly invite sinners to his grace, and most graciously calls them to repentance, seemingly, as though he was earnestly desirous of their salvation: the other will is inward and secret, which is irresistible, and takes effect infallibly; and by this he brings, through ways unavoidable, to an estate and course of sin here, and then to eternal damnation and punishment hereafter.' Such a view of God could never have been entertained by such a mind as Calvin's, had it not been obscured and abused by its adherence to an erroneous system. Against this, as a caricature of God, we protest—we protest, by all the arguments and scriptural declarations adduced. Against it we protest, by the oath of the Most High. 'As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth.'—Ezek. xxxiii. 11. Against it we protest, by the yearnings of Divine compassion. 'How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee, Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zeboim? mine heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together. I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim: for I am God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee.'—Hosea xi. 8, 9. Against it we protest, by the tears of the Redeemer, the inexpressible pity and anguish of the Son of God, who, drawing near the guilty city of Jerusalem, wept over it, exclaiming, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thee, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, but ye would not! Oh, that thou hadst known, in this thy day, the things that make for thy peace; but now they are hid from thine eyes.'—Matt. xxiii. 37. 'Let God be true, but every man a liar.'—Rom. iii. 4.

Before we dismiss this part of our subject, it may be deemed requisite to advert to one or two passages, which our Calvin-

istic brethren have supposed to favour their views in reference to reprobation. Passages of Scripture, in reference to Christ's dying for only a part of mankind, we have none to examine; for as we have before stated, there is not one in the Bible; and our Calvinistic friends, aware of this, have adduced none. We have searched the Westminster Confession, the two Catechisms, the writings of Calvin, and other divines of that school, and there is not one text adduced in proof of this dogma. This fact is worthy of being well noticed, as it speaks volumes in behalf of our views, and materially shortens the controversy. Nevertheless, while no texts are brought forward to prove the limited extent of the atonement, several passages are introduced to sanction the doctrine of reprobation. We shall notice a few. But here let it be premised that, in a volume containing a revelation from God to man, it might be very naturally expected that some parts would not be so intelligible as others. When it is remembered, too, that the sacred writings abound with allusions to customs now obsolete, with modes of speech and turns of phraseology peculiar to the languages in which they were written, and in our version are presented to the mind through the imperfect medium of a translation, the occurrence of some difficult and obscure portions will be matter of no surprise. Some such difficult portions there are in the Word of God, and several of them have been adopted as the foundation of the peculiarities of the Calvinistic creed. Now, in the interpretation of Scripture, the rational mode is, not first to construct a theory, and then to select a few isolated and obscure passages as the basis of the preconceived system; but to compare one passage with another, to apply those which are obvious and clear to shed light upon those which are difficult and obscure. The light of the moon is useful to us, but not sufficient to show us the diversified hues and beauties of the landscape; and it would be but a cold, cheerless, and imperfect substitute for the sun, and no one in his right mind could desire the change; yet, some of our Calvinistic brethren have adopted a course which, in our view, is equally unwise. Truths which shine forth conspicuously in every page of the Bible, have been superseded by abstruse, metaphysical subtleties; and numerous passages the most clear and luminous, have been shut out, or obscured by forced interpretations upon a

few difficult texts, detached from their proper connection, and from the general scope of the inspired writers. We would pursue an opposite course—we would seek our first principles of religious belief from the clearest and most obvious portions of God's Word; and obscure and difficult texts we would explain by the light which the plainest and easiest passages afford. If, therefore, the Scriptures plainly teach that God loves all men—that he hates nothing that he has made—that Christ has died for all men, and procured salvation for the whole world, there can be nothing *contrary* to this doctrine taught in the Scriptures; and, consequently, the notion of unconditional reprobation is not a Scriptural doctrine. Whatever difficulties certain obscure passages may present, they cannot teach this notion, for it is contrary to the plainest testimony of the Bible, and the very first principles of religion—the justice and the goodness of God.

The passage in Rom. ix. 13, where it is said—'Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated,' is often quoted in favour of unconditional election and reprobation; but viewed in connection with the context and its parallel passages, it is evident no such doctrine is implied. For, in the first place, it is not Esau and Jacob *personally*, who are referred to, but their *posterity;* as appears from Mal. i. 2, 3, and from the entire drift of the Apostle's discourse. In the second place, the term 'to hate,' is not used in the sense of *to detest* or *to abhor*, but, to regard with a less degree of favour. This may be illustrated by our Lord's declaration—'If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.' —Luke xiv. 26. Every one knows the term hatred in this passage means not detestation, but a less degree of love; hence, in a parallel passage, our Lord says—'He that loveth father or mother *more* than me is not worthy of me.'—Matt. x. 37. We love our parents, children, and kindred, with strong and tender affection; but as Christians we love God more. The fact, however, of our loving God supremely, does not diminish our love for our fellow-creatures: on the contrary, it refines and strengthens our natural affections. God had a special regard for the descendants of Jacob, and made them, as will hereafter be shown, subjects of various external privileges; but he did

not abhor the seed of Esau, or exclude them from his favour on that account; for 'God is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.'—Ps. cxlv. 9. He no more hated Esau than a true Christian hates the wife of his bosom, or the offspring of his body. God had certain benevolent purposes to accomplish; his merciful designs were to be revealed—a dispensation of religious privileges was to be established, and in due time the Messiah was to be given; and he chose the seed of Jacob, instead of Esau, as the medium through which these purposes should be fulfilled. In this sense, Jacob, though the younger, was preferred to Esau. It is in reference to this fact that the Apostle observes, 'So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy.'—Rom. ix. 16. Isaac *willed* to give the blessing to Esau, and Esau *ran* to the field to hunt for venison, that he might bring it to his father, and secure the privileges connected with primogeniture; but God had determined otherwise, and frustrated their intentions. He had a sovereign right to select which he pleased; and, for reasons sufficient to his own infinite wisdom, he preferred the seed of Jacob to that of Esau; still, Esau and his descendants were objects of his mercy. Esau as well as Jacob received the rite of circumcision, the seal of God's redeeming covenant; and both he and his descendants were included in the promise of general salvation through the seed that was to come from the patriarch's loins. Blessings were pronounced upon them; and, as we have seen, for them as well as for all others, the atonement of Christ was undertaken and fulfilled.

Another passage, adduced in favour of eternal and unconditional reprobation, is that which refers to Pharaoh, as a monument of the Divine displeasure: 'For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.'—Rom. ix. 17, 18. There are two points in this passage claimed in favour of reprobation—namely, that of Pharaoh's being '*raised up*' for a certain purpose, and that of his being '*hardened*.' These have been supposed to mean that Pharaoh was brought into existence to sin against God; and

that, to complete his depravity and wickedness, he was supernaturally hardened, to the end that God might be glorified in the destruction of this haughty monarch, and in the awful judgments poured down upon his kingdom. Such a view is derogatory to the character of God, as it makes him the author of sin; and is contradictory to the plainest truths of the Scriptures—contradictory to the principles we have before established—namely, that 'God is good to all,' and has given his Son to die for all. If, in love, Christ died for all, he died for Pharaoh; and if he died for Pharaoh's salvation, there could have been no eternal decree for his destruction. The passage has quite a different meaning: for, in reference to Pharaoh's being raised up, the original word עָמַד has no reference to his being born or brought into existence; it literally means *to make to stand*, or *to support*, and this is the rendering in the margin of our version. The correct meaning, then, is, 'For this cause have I supported thee' during all the dreadful plagues and judgments which have been inflicted. All the ancient versions unitedly confirm this view. The Septuagint has Καὶ ἕνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης—'*For this reason thou hast been preserved.*' The Arabic renders it—'For this purpose I have preserved thee.' The Chaldee Paraphrase renders it—'For this I have sustained thee;' and both the Samaritan and the Syriac versions agree with this meaning. Thus, the Calvinistic idea is excluded from the text.

In reference to the *hardening* of Pharaoh, when the context is examined, a solution, equally easy, is presented. Even a mere English reader, well acquainted with the Bible, knows, that in Scripture phraseology, God is often said to do a thing which he merely permits to be done. Thus, in Exod. vii. 3, the act of *hardening* is ascribed to God; but in verse 15 of the following chapter it is ascribed to Pharaoh *himself*—'But when Pharaoh saw that there was respite, he hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them; as the Lord had said.' The fact is, that this wicked monarch had long resisted the providence of God, insulted and vexed his Holy Spirit, until God withdrew his Spirit from him, and gave him up to the blindness and hardness of his own heart. Then he persevered in sin without restraint—became a vessel of wrath, fitted by his own depravity and guilt for destruction; and it appears that God continued

Pharaoh's existence longer, that, in his example and doom, he might present to the Israelites and surrounding nations an instructive manifestation of his own holiness, power, and glory—of his judicial providence, and his terrible displeasure against idolatry and sin. Thus, the sins of Pharaoh were his own voluntary acts; and his doom was the result, not of any arbitrary decree, but of his wilful perversity and rebellion: an awful admonition to all who reject the counsel of God. 'Because there is wrath, beware, lest he take thee away with his stroke; then a great ransom cannot deliver thee.' For, 'he that being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy.'

The same principle of interpretation applies to all those Scriptures where God is said to cause men to be the subjects of spiritual blindness and hardness of heart. Let the peculiar phraseology of Scripture be considered, and the parallel passages be referred to, and difficulties vanish. We take another example in point:—In Isa. vi. God is described as commanding the prophet—'Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed.' Here the prophet himself, at the command of God, is represented as the *agent* or cause of the people's impenitence; but the prophet Isaiah was not the agent or cause of the people's blindness and hardness of heart. He foretold the event, but he had been dead 700 years when the event took place. Let us refer to a parallel passage, and there we shall find that the blindness of the Jews was wilful, and their impenitence is charged home upon their own obstinacy. In Acts xxviii. we have the fulfilment of this prophecy, as declared by the Apostle—'Well spake Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive: for the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have *they* closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.' Here, when the bold and elevated language

of prophecy is dropped, and its fulfilment recorded, as an historical fact, we find that the blindness and impenitence are the *people's own:* a state they have brought upon *themselves*, and not what *another* had brought upon them—a state of *wilful* sin, not an unavoidable calamity. Of Pharaoh it is said, that he hardened his *own* heart: and of the Jews, that their eyes have *they* closed. There is, therefore, nothing in these passages that favours the Calvinistic theory of reprobation.

There are other passages which have been alleged in favour of reprobation; but we have not space to notice them. We have, however, intentionally adduced those on which the greatest stress is laid; and, in explaining them, have laid down principles by which others may be interpreted. We never met with one text which was not capable of a rational explication, in perfect harmony with the doctrine of universal redemption. The Scriptures are the best interpreters of their own meaning. Let one text be brought to elucidate another—the literal to unfold the figurative, and the plain to illustrate the obscure; and then every apparent discrepancy is removed, every difficulty obviated, and the Bible seen to be a book, like its Divine Author, full of wisdom, truth, and goodness.

Whether, therefore, we refer to those portions of the sacred writings which speak of the fulness and freeness of God's love to man, of the atonement of Christ, or to those adduced by Calvinistic writers, in favour of their own theory, we clearly see that the doctrine of unconditional reprobation is without foundation. It is nowhere contained in the Bible: therefore, we reject it as a human figment; and in its stead, we adopt the animating doctrine of universal redemption.

Leaving the doctrine of reprobation, we have now to speak of election, and establish our next proposition:—

II. That although Christ died for all, yet no part of mankind are unconditionally and absolutely elected to everlasting life; but that every person's salvation depends, in a subordinate sense, upon his own choice and conduct.

To elect is to choose; election is simply the act of choosing. In the Holy Scriptures, these terms, which are one in sense, and used indiscriminately by our translators, are applied sometimes to individuals, and sometimes to whole communities, but never contain the least intimation of an unconditional appoint-

ment to everlasting life. In order to ascertain the exact sense of these words, as employed in the word of God, it will be needful to refer to the principal passages where they occur.

1. The term elect is applied to Jesus Christ. Isa. xlii. 1—'Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine *elect*, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.' Peter applies the same term to Christ—1 Peter ii. 6—'Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, *elect*, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded.' In these passages Christ is called God's elect, because he was chosen by him to be the Saviour of men, and it is applied to him as a mark of Divine approval. God was well pleased with both his character and his work.

2. The term elect is also applied to holy angels. Thus, Paul addresses Timothy (1 Tim. v. 21)—'I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the *elect* angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality.' This passage is, in the Westminster Confession, urged in proof of a definite number of angels being unconditionally appointed to eternal happiness, the rest being pre-ordained to everlasting misery. If this were true, it would have been strange indeed for the Apostle to connect this doctrine with the solemn charge here given to Timothy. Here is a solemn admonition to Timothy against *partiality—against preferring one person to another;* and yet in the same passage the Calvinistic theory presents the most obvious manifestation of such partiality on the part of God; for the Westminster Confession asserts, 'that election is without any foresight of faith or good works in the creature, as conditions influencing God in his choice.' In such an election of angels, then, what motive could be here presented to Timothy, inducing him to act without preference or partiality towards men? Surely none, but the very contrary. For, if the Apostle had wished him to act with partiality, and to give an indiscriminate preference to individuals, he could not have done it more effectually than by presenting before him the example of God in exercising an indiscriminate preference and partiality towards angels, predestinating some to eternal life, and consigning others to eternal death, according to the mere pleasure of his will, and without any motive arising from a foresight of their

character or works. The Calvinistic notion of election as applied to this passage, would involve the Apostle in gross inconsistency and absurdity. We are compelled, therefore, to reject it, for its philosophy and divinity are equally at fault. And, as this is the *only* passage in the whole Scriptures where the term elect is applied to angels, of course, the theory of election, as it refers to those beings, is left without foundation. What then is the meaning of the Apostle? Simply this. The angels, like ourselves, were once in a probationary state. Some kept not their first estate, but fell into rebellion against God, and were, in consequence, banished from his presence, and are reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the day of judgment; but others retained their innocence and holiness, and passed the period of their trial with fidelity and obedience. These are, in consequence, now approved of God, and chosen to a state of unalterable and eternal happiness; and in the passage before us are called the *elect* angels, in contradistinction to the *fallen* angels. In this view the Apostle's words have great propriety and force. 'I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality.' As if he had said, 'Act as God himself does in respect to both angels and men'—that is, without 'partiality,' without respect of persons. Be animated and encouraged also to fidelity by the happy destiny of the angels who have kept their allegiance to God, and obtained their eternal reward.

3. .We often find the term elect, or chosen, applied to persons who are selected to occupy official situations both under the Old and New Testament dispensations.

(*a*) The term is applied to the priests under the law: Deut. xxi. 5—'And the priests the sons of Levi shall come near; for them the Lord thy God hath *chosen* to minister unto him, and to bless in the name of the Lord.' But the fact of their being thus *elected* did not absolutely secure either their holiness in this life, or their happiness in the life to come. Nadab and Abihu, who brought strange fire before the Lord, and were consumed in his wrath, were thus elected; and the wicked sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, who sinned grievously against God, and were destroyed in his righteous indignation, were also of the

chosen. From the judicial proceedings of God with the house of Eli, we see also, that though that family was *chosen* (elected) to the priesthood for ever, yet, when they degenerated into great wickedness, God revoked his promise, and transferred his choice to another family. Mark the following passages:—1 Samuel ii. 28, 30, 34, 35—'And did I *choose* him out of all the tribes of Israel to be my priest, to offer upon mine altar, to burn incense, to wear an ephod before me? I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy father, should walk before me for ever: but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me; for them that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed. And this shall be a sign unto thee, that shall come upon thy two sons, on Hophni and Phinehas; in one day they shall die both of them. And I will raise me up a faithful priest, that shall do according to that which is in mine heart and in my mind: and I will build him a sure house; and he shall walk before mine anointed for ever.' This awful judgment was inflicted. Hophni and Phinehas were slain; and, in the reign of Solomon, Abiathar, the last priest of the house of Eli, was thrust from his office, and Zadok exalted to his place. Then the succession was changed, and the prediction circumstantially fulfilled. From this instructive portion of sacred history, we clearly see that an 'election' to the highest official situation in the Church implies no unchangeable security of the Divine favour; and that God's promises and covenant engagements, even when apparently absolute in form, are conditional in fact. The event now under review furnishes a principle of interpretation which will apply to the solution of many other passages.

(*b*) Kings and rulers are frequently called God's elect, or chosen. David was *chosen* by God to reign over Israel. 'He *chose* David his servant, and took him from the sheep-folds; and he brought him to feed Jacob his people, and Israel his inheritance.' But David knew that neither the dignity God had given him, nor the holy oil which had been officially poured upon him, was sufficient to secure to him eternal salvation; hence, he earnestly prays—'Consider me and hear me, O Lord my God: lighten mine eyes, lest I sleep the sleep of death.' Solomon also, in preference to Adonijah, was chosen of the Lord to be king in Israel; but his exaltation to an earthly

kingdom did not secure to him an inheritance in the kingdom of heaven. Many contend for Solomon's election to eternal life, and allege the following passage as the foundation of their belief:—'I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: but my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee.'—2 Sam. vii. 14, 15. These declarations, however, referred merely to his *temporal* state, and the permanent establishment of his throne, which, notwithstanding his departure from God, was continued to him during life for the sake of his father David. But when reference is made to his *spiritual and eternal state*, very different language is employed. Instead of any unconditional promise or assurance being given to him of his perpetual security, he is reminded of his danger, and warned against apostasy, on the pain of eternal banishment from God. 'And thou, Solomon my son, know thou the God of thy father, and serve him with a perfect heart and with a willing mind: for the Lord searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts: if thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, *he will cast thee off for ever*.'—1 Chron. xxviii. 9.

(*c*) The prophets were especially chosen, selected from the mass of men, to make known the will of God. Thus, of Jeremiah the Almighty says, 'Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.'—Jer. i. 5. But the fact of Jeremiah's being sanctified—that is, set apart for the prophetic office—implied nothing fixed and absolute as to his eternal state. It did not secure even his personal piety; for some have been endued with the spirit of prophecy who have not possessed the spirit of holiness. Hence, Balaam, who loved the wages of unrighteousness; the old prophet at Bethel, who deceived the man of God to his destruction; and Caiaphas, who joined in the condemnation of the Saviour, had each a sudden illapse of the prophetic spirit. The appointment of Jeremiah to be a prophet to Israel was an arrangement of Divine Providence, accompanied, doubtless, with gracious influence, and supernatural gifts, which, if improved, would render the prophet both

holy and useful; but if neglected, would aggravate his guilt, and bring down heavier punishment.

(*d*) In precisely the same sense the apostles were *elected* to preach the Gospel, and be witnesses for Christ. 'And he called unto him his disciples: and of them he *elected* twelve, whom also he named apostles.'—Luke vi. 13. But the exalted privilege of being elected to the apostleship did not render their salvation secure; for, amongst those thus chosen and favoured, was Judas, who betrayed him! and of whom it is said, 'It had been good for that man if he had not been born.'—Matt. xxvi. 24. 'Have I not elected you twelve, and one of you is a devil?'—John vi. 70. Paul is expressly called a chosen vessel, to bear the name of Jesus 'before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel.'—Acts ix. 15. But Paul did not regard his being thus elected as an absolute predestination to everlasting happiness; so far from this, he spoke of himself as in danger, and saw it necessary to use the most strenuous exertions to keep under his body, and bring it into subjection, lest, by any means, when he had preached to others, he himself should be cast away.—1 Cor. ix. 27.

From these examples it is most evident that the election of individuals to official situations, however high and important, implies nothing in reference to their final destiny. True, their privileges are increased, but their responsibilities are proportionately augmented; for, 'where much is given, much will be required,' and 'he that knoweth his master's will, and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes.'

4. The term elect is also used in a more extensive sense, and applied to whole communities.

(*a*) Under the Old Testament dispensation, the Jews, as a nation, were thus distinguished. In order to preserve amongst mankind the knowledge and worship of himself, as the only true God, to make a gradual development of his great plan of redeeming mercy, and prepare the world for the coming of the Messiah, it pleased the Almighty to select one branch of the family of Abraham, as the medium through which these important designs should be accomplished. To this end he multiplied them into a great nation, revealed himself to them as their covenant God, made bare his mighty arm in their protection and deliverance, discovered to them his gracious pur-

poses, established amongst them a typical system of worship, gave them the ministry of prophets for many generations, and conferred upon them numerous and important privileges. 'To them pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.' As a natural result of these privileges, the Jews are characterized by corresponding titles and appellations expressive of their general relationship to Jehovah. They are called the chosen or elect of God. 'But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have *chosen*, the seed of Abraham my friend.'—Isa. xli. 8. 'For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath *chosen* thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth.' 'For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee (Cyrus) by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me.'—Isaiah xlv. 4. But does the application of these terms either express or imply that the Jews as a nation were absolutely pre-ordained to immortal happiness? By no means. Such a supposition is incompatible with the nature of God and the express declaration of his Word—for 'He is of purer eyes than to behold evil,' and has said that all the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment. But the terms elect and chosen are applied to the whole nation, without exception or distinction as to the characters composing it. In the nation there were, it is true, some persons eminently pious; but there were at the same time many notoriously wicked: many who lived and died in the greatest crimes—idolaters, liars, thieves, adulterers, and murderers, who died as they lived; and many who perished as signal monuments of the Divine wrath. Notwithstanding, all the descendants of Jacob, both good and bad, those that were eternally saved and those eternally lost, were all indiscriminately called 'the elect of God.' Ahab and Jezebel, and all the priests of Baal, as being of that nation, were chosen or elected as well as others. Hence it follows, that the terms had no reference to the eternal destiny of men. Destiny or predetermination in reference to a future state had nothing to do with their election. In reference to the Jewish community, their election simply meant that they were chosen to certain external privileges—that they were distinguished from other

nations in being selected by God as a people to whom he had revealed his will, to whom he had given religious ordinances, and with whom he had engaged himself in covenant. It is true these external and general favours were intended to lead to higher and more important blessings, to personal salvation; but God's covenant was conditional, their state was probationary, and every privilege might be either improved or forfeited. For thus saith Moses, the inspired instructor of the people: 'I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore *choose* life, that both thou and thy seed may live.'—Deut. xxx. 19. *God* chose their privileges, but life or death was to be chosen by *themselves!* Some of the Jews were obedient and faithful; they improved their privileges and kept the covenant of the Lord, and such were eternally saved; but others despised the riches of God's goodness, resisted his merciful designs, and trampled under foot his covenant, and they were doomed to eternal perdition! For 'we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth;' that he 'will render to every man according to his deeds: indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew *first* (as the most highly privileged), and also of the Gentile; but glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile: for there is no respect of persons with God.'—Rom. ii. 2—11.

(*b*) In exactly the same sense, election is applied to *Christian* communities. It is a remarkable fact, and one which plainly shows the conditional state of the elected, that the Jews, formerly designated 'the chosen,' are now, and have been for the period of eighteen centuries, rejected; and the privileges they once enjoyed are transferred to others. When the Jews, as a nation, put away from them the word of eternal life, it was sent unto the Gentiles; and those who received it became distinguished and honoured by the same appellations as had been before applied to the Jews. This was natural. The apostles being familiar with the Old Testament, would be likely to use its phraseology, and in writing to different churches would apply to them the terms and distinctions which for ages had been given to the Jewish people: moreover, it was the will of the Lord that this should be the case—that the Gentiles now

received within the pale of his Church, and forming the majority of its members, should have every formal recognition of their new and interesting relationship to him; doubtless, therefore, the Spirit of God led the New Testament writers to adopt the titles which had before belonged to the Jewish Church.

Thus we find Christian communities are called 'a *chosen* generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God.' Such phrases, however, were applied to the *whole* visible Church, with the same latitude as they had been before applied to the Jewish people, and without discrimination as to their character. St Peter, presenting a Christian salutation, says, 'The *church* that is at Babylon, *elected* together with you, saluteth you.'—1 Peter v. 13. Thus 'the elect' is the common phrase for a Christian community, and is synonymous with 'the privileged' people. The same Apostle, addressing several communities existing in different regions, employs the same phraseology. 'Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, *elect* according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied.'—1 Peter i. 1, 2. These persons were chosen to Gospel privileges; but not unconditionally appointed to everlasting life. They were placed in very favourable circumstances, according to God's previous design or foreknowledge, and their salvation was the object desired, but not absolutely secured. Some, no doubt, had a personal interest in Christ—they were renewed or sanctified by the Holy Spirit—had the atoning blood of Christ sprinkled upon their hearts—were walking in holy obedience to God—and were in consequence approved of God, as heirs of eternal glory; but their eternal happiness was not determined by their election—it was still dependent upon their own vigilance, fidelity, and perseverance. Hence the same Apostle exhorts these believers to give all diligence to make their calling and *election sure*.—2 Peter i. 10. From this it is evident that however great the privileges connected with their being elected, their salvation was not made *sure* by it. It was not a something done *for them*, but a something to be done *by them*. God had granted

them the election by his free grace; but they themselves were to make it *sure* by their *own diligence*, else they would receive the grace of God in vain.

In writing to the Ephesian Church, Paul employs the same terms now under review. He congratulates the members thereof as being *chosen* in Christ before the foundation of the world, that they should be holy and without blame before him in love; being predestinated to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.—Eph. i. 4, 5. Strong as are the expressions here employed, they contain not one idea of unconditional election to everlasting life. The Ephesians were Gentiles; and it formed a part of God's design, when the plan of redemption was formed, that the Gentiles should in due time be freely admitted to its privileges. On this account they are said to be predestinated and chosen before the foundation of the world; and the gracious purpose of their being thus favoured was, as the Apostle states, that they might be holy and become the adopted children of God. These were the personal privileges held out to them by the Gospel, and which many of them at this time enjoyed. Still, their eternal salvation was conditional, and depended upon their personal exertion, as the whole scope of the epistle sufficiently proves. There is no evidence that all the members of the Ephesian Church were genuine converts; yet the term 'elect' is applicable to all, for all were chosen to Gospel ordinances; nor is there any proof that all the true believers in that Church were faithful unto death, although they are all said to be predestinated to the adoption of children. On the contrary, the admonitions of the Apostle indicate a state of danger, and his predictions, indeed, speak expressly of an apostasy amongst them. 'Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of *your own selves* shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.'—Acts xx. 28—30. Not many years after this admonition, the Ephesian Church, with all its privileges of election and adoption, had left its first love; and at this day the city is a heap of ruin, and the Church, once

so flourishing, long since blotted from the map of the Christian world.

(*c*) *All* the disciples of Christ were called his elect—his chosen ones. 'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit.'—John xv. 16. Christ had called them from the world, favoured them with his instructions, and elected them to be his disciples; but they were required to use personal diligence, to improve the privileges afforded, and bring forth fruit. Here was increasing responsibility combined with additional opportunities, but no absolute security promised. On the contrary, Christ himself tells them that, if not fruitful, they were to be cut off from the true vine, and to be consumed. 'I am the vine, ye are the branches. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.'—John xv. 5, 6. Among those thus chosen was the treacherous Judas; but, notwithstanding his election, it would have been good for him had he never been born; and so will it be with all who neglect the great salvation; however high their privileges, they will be thrust down to hell. In the sense we have now explained, the members of every Christian community in the present day are *elected*, are thus chosen of God. We have Christian Sabbaths, Gospel ordinances, and the ministry of reconciliation, whilst vast portions of the earth, comprehending hundreds of millions of our fellow-men, are in midnight darkness. This is the day of our merciful visitation. It behoves us, therefore, to be wise, to know in this our day the things that make for our peace.

5. Sometimes the term 'elect' is used in a more limited sense, and applied *personally* to true believers only. Such, having improved the favour of their election to Gospel privileges, are received into the Divine favour, and chosen to reign with Christ eternally in heaven. It is in reference to such that St Paul asks in triumph—'Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's *elect?* It is God that justifieth.'—Rom. viii. 33. All who have truly repented of sin and believed in Christ are justified; and all who are justified are become the children of God, and heirs of eternal glory; and God will acknowledge them for his in the day when he makes up his jewels. This is their election. In addressing true believers, the same Apostle

exhorts—'Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, even as Christ forgave you.'—Col. iii. 12, 13. Those whose sins are forgiven, and who exemplify the graces here mentioned, have a *personal* and saving interest in the covenant of grace, and stand individually entitled to all the blessings which the Saviour has purchased. Such are, in the highest sense, *elected;* that is, they are approved of God, and chosen to everlasting joys, which shall assuredly be realized by all who are faithful unto death.

The Saviour says, 'Many are called, but few are chosen.'—Matt. xxii. 14. This is the concluding sentence of a most instructive parable, and it bears directly upon the question at issue. A certain king made a marriage feast for his son—rich and abundant provision is made in the Gospel. Many were called by the king's servants, but such only were chosen (approved) who accepted the invitation, and put on the 'wedding garment.' Many are called by the Gospel, invited, admonished, besought; but such only are *chosen* to eternal blessedness as obey the call, become obedient to the truth, and walk in holiness of life; and these, alas! are few compared with the multitudes who are called by the Gospel of God. Millions are every Sabbath called by the Gospel ministry; but how few yield to be saved by grace, so as to be approved of God, and chosen to reign with Him in heaven! This is the only true interpretation of the passage before us, and instead of establishing, it totally overthrows the doctrine of Calvinistic election; for it shows that the choice of God refers to the *character*, and not solely the *persons* of men; that, instead of having *no* respect to the works or qualities of men, as conditions of their election, it has *all* respect to their works and moral qualities; and that, instead of men being pre-ordained in the counsels of eternity, this special election to eternal life never takes place until a man's character is formed anew by the grace of God. Then, and not till then, is he chosen to life everlasting!

But even the *special* and *personal* election of which we are now speaking is not absolute; it does not imply that all danger is past, that apostasy is impossible, and our admission to heaven

unalterably secured. Such a state would be an end to our probation, and that can never take place while we are in the present evil world. We are aware that the contrary is held in the Westminster Confession, and that the following passage is quoted in support of the notion—'For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.'—Rom. viii. 29, 30. But a careful examination of the passage, and a comparison of it with other portions of Scripture, will show that no such thing as the doctrine of unconditional election, or necessary final perseverance, is taught.

The whole drift of Scripture teaches that man's eternal happiness is contingent through the whole of his probationary state, and depends not upon any absolute decree, but upon his own faithfulness; and that even in the highest attainments of grace, the Christian, the elect Christian, is in danger of falling. Hence the admonition, 'Let us therefore *fear*, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it.'—Heb. iv. 1. But if our eternal destiny be fixed by an irrevocable decree, why should we fear? for our fears can exert no influence upon that which is irrevocably fixed. The same Apostle again admonishes—'Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth (most assuredly standeth) take heed lest he fall.'—1 Cor. x. 12. This passage and the context most evidently imply that the Christian may fall, and that for ever. In the preceding verses the Apostle refers to the Israelites, the elect people of God, and shows that many of them lusted, tempted Christ, committed fornication, became guilty of idolatry, and, as the consequence, finally perished. In these things he says they are ensamples to us, and their history is written for our admonition. But why written for our admonition? Because we are exposed to the same danger: and if so, our eternal salvation must be contingent. From such a view, the warning has great force—'Take heed lest *ye* fall.' Peter, addressing the elect, the truly pious, who are chosen in Christ as heirs of everlasting glory, refers to the state of some, once partakers of the same blessedness, but who had turned like the dog, 'to his

own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.' And in reference to the final doom of such, he says, they 'shall receive the reward of unrighteousness'—even as God 'spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell.' In another place, speaking of the same characters, he declares—'But he that lacketh these things (the graces of the Holy Spirit) is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.' Certainly the characters here set forth were not at first formalists or hypocrites, but sincere believers, in a state of salvation; 'they had been purged from their old sins,' and therefore were elected to everlasting life; but though thus once in a state of grace, they had so far lost the blessings of salvation, that they even denied that salvation! How had they lost these blessings, and sunk into such an awful state of apostasy? The Apostle tells us, by ceasing to give 'all diligence.' It is from such fearful examples of the possibility of falling from God, and forfeiting our eternal reward, that he urges the salutary exhortation in the verse following: 'Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and *election sure*.'—2 Peter i. 10.

We select one passage more, in which not only is the possibility of apostasy clearly taught, but cases of such an awful nature are adverted to, as exclude the individuals from repentance and recovery: 'For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame:' and adverting to the final doom of such, he declares, 'There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.'—Heb. vi. 4—6; x. 26, 27. That the apostates here described and consigned to everlasting perdition were once in a state of saving grace, is manifest from the deep aggravation of their sin in falling from God, and from the terms employed in speaking of them. If any terms can describe and designate a state of salvation, those here employed designate that state. These apostates were once *enlightened*, they had *tasted* of the heavenly gift,

they had been *purged* from their old sins, and they had been *sprinkled* with the blood of Christ, *sanctified*, and made *partakers* of the Holy Ghost; consequently, they were once the true people of God, and elected to everlasting life; but they had not given diligence to make their calling and election sure; they had fallen from Christ, and their end was to be burned. From these passages we plainly see that no man, however high his privileges and religious attainments, is ever the subject of any unconditional or absolute appointment to eternal life. While in this world he is in a state of probation, which implies danger, and requires faithfulness and perseverance: he must 'work out his salvation with fear and trembling.'

With the light the Scriptures thus afford respecting the circumstances in which true believers are placed, we may now return to the passage in the 8th of Romans before mentioned; and as we are assured that one text cannot contradict another, we are forced to the conclusion, that the passage in question cannot teach what our Calvinistic brethren have supposed it to mean.

The text is supposed to be the stronghold of Calvinism, and therefore we shall take special pains to give its true interpretation. We repeat the Apostle's words—'For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.' Now, if this passage have any bearing in favour of the Calvinistic theory, it must be found in the two terms, '*foreknow*' and '*predestinated;*' and in the sequence of blessings connected by the particle '*also.*' A brief examination of each will, we think, show that the Calvinistic doctrine is neither expressed nor implied in the text before us. To *foreknow* is to *know* a thing before it comes to pass. That which God foreknew in this passage, is the extension of Gospel privileges to Gentiles as well as Jews. If it be contended that God foreknows man's eternal destiny, we reply, This is not what is referred to in this passage; and if it were, God's foreknowledge is perfectly compatible with man's free agency; for it exercises neither control nor influence upon that which is foreknown. In fact, God's foreknowledge has no more influence upon human volition or human conduct,

than it has over the diurnal rotation of the earth.* '*Predestinated*'—this has been understood to mean an absolute decree to eternal salvation. It has no such meaning. The word προώρισε does not mean absolute destiny or fate, but *to design or intend a thing beforehand.* We have examined every text of Scripture where the word occurs, and find that it expresses not the immutably fixing of a thing, but God's gracious *intention* as to the Gospel. The question then arises, What did God intend or pre-design? The Apostle tells us that design is, that men should be conformed to the image of God's dear Son; or, in other words, that men should be holy. This is the scope, purpose, and design of God in his calling men by the Gospel; a result he contemplated from all eternity. But this intention or design applies to all men whomsoever—whomsoever he may call, whether Gentile or Jew.

As to the sequence of blessings, calling, justifying, and glorifying, connected by the particle '*also:*' does the Apostle mean that these blessings invariably and unavoidably follow each other, so that every person who is called is also justified, and every one who is justified is also glorified? and that every person who receives the first blessing never fails to receive the second, the third, &c., and is thus infallibly and eternally saved if once he be in a state of salvation? We have already shown the contrary in the awful instances of apostasy named by Paul, in Heb. vi. 4—8; 2 Peter i. 9. There are, and have been in all ages, hundreds, yea, thousands, who once ran well, but whom Satan hath hindered; who have returned like the dog to his vomit, and have finally perished. It will then be inquired, What is the meaning of the sequence indicated in the passage before us? We reply, the Apostle is asserting the gracious purpose of God in its gradual development and its ultimate consummation. Thus the Apostle in enumerating these Christian privileges, and marking their sequence, is not speaking of them as following each other with absolute and never failing certainty in the experience of every one called by the Gospel, but as blessings designed in common for both Jews and Gentiles, and actually realized by all who are faithful to the grace of God.

* See the subject of God's foreknowledge and man's free agency considered at length in the author's work on 'The Deity,' pp. 276—300.

Is it inquired, How can merely this statement be a consolation to God's people, and an illustration of the assertion, that 'all things work together for good?' we reply, it is an illustration of God's gracious '*purpose;*' and as that purpose contemplates the present holiness, happiness, and eternal blessedness of God's people, it is full of consolation. For if a person be 'called,' he may calculate on the certainty of being 'justified,' if he truly believe; for this is God's 'purpose.' If he be 'justified,' he may calculate with certainty on being 'glorified,' if he be faithful; for this is God's final 'purpose.' These successive blessings are developments of God's glorious purpose in the Gospel, and cannot fail to encourage and comfort the soul of the believer; for every development of God's goodness yields fresh ground for comfort and holy joy. The development of this 'purpose' too, in the experience of God's people, is a proof that 'all things work together for good to them.' For the accomplishment of his great purpose, he must make all other things subservient to it; and thus the providential trials and afflictions of life, being under the control of that God who desires our salvation, will be made to minister to that result, and work out our greatest good. Now we '*know*' this, because we know we are '*called*,' and therefore we rejoice even in tribulation. Such appears to be the plain meaning of this passage—a meaning which at once excludes the Calvinistic notion, and inculcates the free agency of man, and stimulates him to practical diligence.

We have now fully established the two important points we at first undertook to prove, namely—First, that Christ has died for every man, and that therefore no man is predestinated to eternal wrath: and secondly, that while the atonement places all men in a salvable state, still, every man's everlasting happiness depends upon his own conduct, and therefore no man is absolutely and unconditionally predestinated or elected to everlasting life. Election, we have seen, simply means to *choose*, the former being the Latin, and the other the Saxon word, for the same original term. Election, we have shown, is applied to Christ, to angels, to persons called to sustain different offices, as kings, priests, prophets, and apostles; but that in not one of these acceptations has it anything to do with fixing their eternal destiny. We have shown, also, that

when God revealed himself to the descendants of Jacob, and gave them the privileges of an introductory dispensation, then the term 'chosen' was applied to them, to distinguish them from the heathen; and afterwards, when the Gospel dispensation was given to mankind, *all* those who embraced it, even by profession, were called by the same appellations which had before been applied to the Jews; but that in neither case did the application of these terms imply an unconditional appointment to eternal life, inasmuch as the titles in question were given to whole communities, consisting of every variety of character, and many of whom perished in the wrath of God. We have seen, finally, that the term 'elect' is in some instances applied personally to true believers, to genuine Christians only, as expressive of God's love for them, and his approval of them as candidates for heaven; but that even believers, thus privileged and honoured, are not absolutely secure of heaven, and never will be until they arrive there. They *may* persevere to the end, but it is possible for them to draw back unto perdition. This view of the subject harmonizes not only with Scripture, but with man's accountability and the character of God.

It is just to remark that many of our Calvinistic brethren have avowedly renounced the doctrine of unconditional reprobation, and such would rejoice with us to see it wholly extirpated from the Church of God. Although those who confine the Spirit's influence to such persons as are denominated 'the elect' involve themselves in a logical dilemma, yet we rejoice in any approximation to the truth as it is in Jesus. Let us diligently and prayerfully study the Holy Scriptures, and candidly communicate our views; then most assuredly the truth will be elicited, and we shall approach nearer in sentiment and in heart. Faber maintains that the notions of predestination, as held by the Calvinistic school, were never advocated by any of the Christian Fathers until the time of St Augustine. He remarks—'The scheme of interpretation, now familiarly, though perhaps (if a scheme ought to be designated by the name of its *original* contriver) not quite correctly, styled *Calvinism*, may be readily traced back, in the Latin or Western Church, to the time of Augustine. But *here* we find ourselves completely at fault. Augustine, at the

beginning of the fifth century, is the *first* ecclesiastical writer who annexes to the scriptural terms *elect* and *predestinate* the peculiar sense which is now usually styled Calvinistic. With *him*, in a form scarcely less round and perfect than *that* long subsequently proposed by the celebrated Genevan Reformer himself, commenced an entirely new system of interpretation, previously unknown in the Church Catholic. What I state is a mere dry historical fact.'* Such a fact it would be well for our Calvinistic brethren seriously to ponder.

CHAPTER X.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

The justification which we propose to investigate is that of a penitent believer. In this sense, it expresses the fact that he is pardoned and accepted of God, according to the gracious terms of salvation revealed in the Gospel. Justification is the effect of the atonement experimentally realized, purging the sinner's conscience, releasing him from the condemnation of the violated law, and restoring him to the favour of his offended God. Hence it has the same importance in relation to experimental and practical Christianity as the atonement has to the doctrinal fabric of our holy religion. It was justification by faith which Luther designated 'the grand distinction betwixt a standing and a falling church.' The English Reformers held the same sentiment. This doctrine they call 'the strong rock and foundation of the Christian religion.' The revered Wesley justly observes: 'Nothing but this can effectually prevent the increase of the Romish delusion among us, whatever form that delusion may assume, and in whatever degree it may exist; but salvation by faith strikes at the root, and all fall at once when this is established.' It was the undermining of this doctrine which led the Apostle Paul to utter the solemn admonitory expostulation to the Galatians, 'I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: which is not

* Preface to Faber's 'Apostolicity of Trinitarianism.'

another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.' Such language marks the importance of the doctrine, and the duty of preserving it entire and uncorrupt. We intend to unfold the nature of this important blessing, and show the means by which it is obtained. A few preliminary observations, however, appear necessary to facilitate our course of argument.

1. The original word to justify is δικαιόω, and as this term has various acceptations in the Scriptures, it may be of use to glance at them. 1. It means to *pronounce and declare any one to be just.* Thus it is applied to God—'That thou mightest be JUSTIFIED in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.'—Rom. iii. 4. This is the common use of the term in its forensic sense. 2. It means also to *approve, praise, commend.* Hence it is said, that 'the publicans JUSTIFIED God, being baptized with the baptism of John.'—Luke vii. 29. That is, they glorified God by yielding to the truth. In the same sense it is applied to the proud Pharisees, of whom it is said, 'Ye are they which JUSTIFY yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts.' They praised or commended themselves; but God knew their hypocrisy. 3. Again, the word to justify sometimes means *to exemplify and honour the truth by appropriate conduct;* to vindicate our profession by a holy life. Thus, it is said, by our Lord, that 'Wisdom is JUSTIFIED of her children.' Those who are wise to salvation show it by a corresponding deportment. Thus, also, it is said of Abraham, that he 'was JUSTIFIED by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar.'—James ii. 21. That is, the reality of Abraham's piety was demonstrated by his obedience, and his claim to salvation, as a believer, was shown to be valid; for his faith brought forth the genuine fruits of holiness. 4. The word is employed to denote the approving sentence of the Judge at the last day: 'But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be JUSTIFIED, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.'—Matt. xii. 36, 37. Further, to be *justified* means, in an evangelical sense, to be absolved from the guilt we had contracted, from

the punishment to which it had justly exposed us, and to be restored to the Divine favour. In this sense it differs widely from its classic usage, and its use in a forensic application. It expresses the bestowment of *mercy*, not the decision of *justice;* the absolution from deserved penalties, not the declaration of innocence. Yet its application in this sense is appropriate, because it expresses the fact, that the sinner is *treated* as a righteous and holy being, though he has no inherent claim to that title—is admitted to the privileges of the innocent, though it is *grace*, not *law*, which awards them. Thus the term, as applicable to our salvation, has respect to the relative state in which we are placed by the Gospel, rather than to the mode by which it is obtained.

2. It will at once be seen that the application of the term '*justification*,' whether used in a legal or an evangelical sense, always pre-supposes a charge of guilt. We cannot with propriety speak of a person being *justified*, whose innocence had never been called in question. Now, not only is *our* innocence called in question, but our guilt is proved. Previous to justification, there are against us awful charges of transgression, and sentences of condemnation. The Scriptures solemnly declare that 'all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;' that 'both Jews and Gentiles are all under sin;' that 'there is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.'—Rom. iii. 9—12. Now, sin is a transgression of God's holy law; and 'we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.'—Rom. iii. 19.

As transgressors of God's law we are under its curse, and exposed to the awful penalty denounced against sinners. That penalty is everlasting death; for God, to whom we are accountable, has declared, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.' 'The wages of sin is death.' 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.'—Gal. iii. 10; Rom. vi. 23; Ezek. xviii. 20. Thus all are guilty in the sight of God, and condemned by the holy law to everlasting death.

3. Justification, in an evangelical sense, pre-supposes a conviction of our guilt, and a penitent confession of it before God. Here, again, we behold the wide difference between God's justification of a sinner and the justification of a person in a court of law. For in a court of law no man is justified unless either he is really innocent of the crime alleged against him, or his guilt cannot be established for the want of evidence. But in a Gospel sense, no man is justified but he who is *actually* guilty, and whose guilt is unreservedly confessed. A sinner against God can never be justified through default of evidence to convict him, for his guilt is as obvious to the eye of God as to his own consciousness: indeed, he is convicted already by the direct testimony of his heart-searching Judge, and the witness of his own conscience. If justified at all, then, it must be by *mercy*, not by *law;* and must follow the confession of his guilt, not the plea of innocence. It must be by *pardon*, not *acquittal.* To set up the plea of innocence would, indeed, be an impeachment of the Divine veracity, and, as such, would greatly augment his guilt; and, if persevered in, exclude him for ever from Divine mercy. It would leave the rebel under the unmitigated sentence of the law he has broken, which must award him justice without mercy. 'He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy.' 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.'—Prov. xxviii. 13; 1 John i. 8—10.

Having made these preliminary observations, we are prepared to enter more fully into the *nature* of justification. We have already seen that it means the pardon and acceptance of a sinner through faith in Christ as a sacrifice for sin.

1. This view is established throughout the sacred Scriptures. In a variety of passages, justification, pardon, forgiveness, remission of sins, and terms of like import, are used synonymously, to express substantially the same blessing, always including, however, the idea of acceptance as well as pardon. We adduce a few examples. Thus St Paul, proclaiming salvation through Christ to the Jews, says, 'Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this

(Saviour) is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.'—Acts xiii. 38. In this passage, the term to be 'justified from all things,' and to 'receive the forgiveness of sins,' are clearly synonymous; for the things pronounced against us in the law of Moses are the penalties due to transgressors; but he that is forgiven is freed from those penalties and admitted to the Divine favour, and therefore he is justified. In the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, our Lord teaches that pardon, or the bestowment of mercy on the penitent, is justification. 'And he spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others: Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a publican. The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess. And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner. I tell you, this man went down to his house JUSTIFIED *rather* than the other.'—Luke xviii. 9—14. The publican pleaded for mercy—mercy to pardon his transgressions, and introduce him to God's favour. That mercy he obtained, and his forgiveness is expressed by his being *justified*. 'He went down to his house JUSTIFIED *rather* than (or instead of) the other.' That is to say, he was pardoned and accepted; but the Pharisee remained condemned and rejected.

In the third and fourth chapters of Romans, St Paul gives an elaborate and argumentative discourse upon the subject of a sinner's justification; and this blessing he designates by several terms which clearly serve to unfold its meaning. 'For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.

Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.'—Rom. iv. 3—8. Here are several terms employed—*forgiveness of sin, covering of sin, the non-imputing of sin, the imputing of righteousness without works, and the counting of faith for righteousness*, and they represent substantially the same blessing—namely, 'the justifying of the ungodly.' Though these several terms are in a general sense synonymous, yet they serve to exhibit the blessing of justification in its various interesting aspects, and these we shall briefly notice.

(*a*) It is '*forgiveness*,' ver. 7. The character, before being justified, is pronounced '*ungodly*,' and "*without works*;' he has therefore no claim to justification by *merit*. But as a sinner he receives mercy, and his iniquities are *forgiven*. 'Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.'

(*b*) His sins are '*covered*,' ver. 7; that is, are put out of sight—cast into oblivion. If *we* covered our own sins, they would still be exposed to the eye of God, and our deception would aggravate our condemnation; but when God covers them, we are actually free from them; and they whom God makes free are free indeed. Hence, God is said to cast all our sins behind his back: 'as far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us.' He says, 'I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions.' 'I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.'

(*c*) Of the man who is justified it is affirmed that his sins are '*not imputed*' unto him, ver. 8; that is, they are no longer reckoned to his account. If our fellow-creatures imputed no sin to us, it would arise from ignorance; and if we imputed no sin to ourselves, it would be the result of pride and self-deception. But God knows every sin we have committed, with all the ingratitude, baseness, and moral turpitude connected with our transgressions. When he, therefore, imputes no iniquity to us, it implies that it is no longer laid to our charge. We had committed millions of transgressions, but now we are declared as free from their imputation as though we had never sinned at all. We are as free from the imputation of sin as Adam was when he first inhaled the salubrious air of Paradise,

and in his days of innocence rejoiced in communion with God. Hence the Apostle exultingly asks, 'Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.' Our sins, though once as scarlet, are become as white as snow; though red like crimson, they are as wool.

(*d*) Another term employed by the Apostle is that of 'righteousness being imputed to us, without works;' and this is explained by another assertion in the context—namely, that our 'faith is counted unto us for righteousness:' even as 'Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness'—vs. 3—5. These passages will receive a more complete illustration hereafter. At present, we merely observe, they plainly teach that when justified we are accounted righteous, and that not through works, but faith; not by virtue of a perfect obedience to the law, but in consequence of our faith. This faith stands in the place of works; for as one who had fulfilled the whole law would be *actually* righteous, so a person who has not fulfilled that law, but exercised the faith required of him by the Gospel, is accounted righteous, and treated as such. He is indeed 'ungodly' up to the moment of his pardon, because he has broken the holy law in innumerable instances, and is condemned by it; but he believes, he exercises faith, he complies with the requisitions of the Gospel, and his faith is counted to him for righteousness; he is pardoned, he is justified; he is *treated*, in reference to his relation to God and eternity, as an innocent and holy being, 'through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

2. Being justified, and made relatively righteous, it follows that he is freed from all the curses of the law he had broken, and admitted to the privileges of the righteous. No law can condemn a person who fulfils its requirements; for where there is no guilt, there is no penalty: so the sinner being freed from guilt, having now no sin imputed to him, is treated as a righteous person, and therefore as liable to no penalty. For 'there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me

free from the law of sin and death.' The penalty of eternal death *was* denounced against him, but it is repealed; for 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.' As a sinner he *was* under the displeasure of God, but now that displeasure is withdrawn; for 'being justified by faith, he has peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.' Thus, the forgiveness which God grants to a penitent believer is not merely the pardon of a *magistrate*, but the forgiveness of a *father*. The pardon of a magistrate is merely the remission of the legal penalty due to crime; but the forgiveness of a father is the restoration to favour and love. It is acceptance as well as remission. It is the gracious reception of the prodigal, who, on his return, is pressed to his father's embrace, receives the kiss of peace, the ring of adoption, and the garments of praise for the spirit of heaviness. Hence he exclaims, 'O Lord, I will praise thee: though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortest me. Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid: for the Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation.'—Isa. xii. 1, 2,

From the foregoing argument it follows that the person thus justified on earth will, if faithful, be justified—that is, accepted and approved—in the solemn day of judgment. All the sins he has committed will not have power to condemn him in that day. In fact, he will not be judged for them. They will no more be laid to his charge than if he had never committed them. Justified freely now, he will be accepted and approved then, and take his place at the right hand of the Judge.

3. A person justified or declared innocent in a court of judicature is *legally* entitled to all the rights and privileges of a good citizen. So, a sinner, though legally entitled to nothing but wrath, yet when justified by the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, is entitled, through *grace*, to all the privileges of the righteous. He is placed in new circumstances and relations. All the promises of the covenant are his. He is introduced to all the blessings of the Gospel; he has access to God, the witness of the Spirit, and a blessed hope of everlasting life. As a child of God, he is an heir of God, and a joint heir with Christ Jesus.

4. We are aware that against the views we have now expressed respecting the removal of all the penalties of sin, it may be alleged that many of the consequences of sin are experienced in the present state, and that our being justified or pardoned does not exempt us from these sufferings. We reply: First—Although the righteous are destined in the present life to share a multitude of sufferings resulting from sin, yet those sufferings are not inflicted as indications of the Divine displeasure against *them personally*, for such displeasure has no existence. Secondly—The evils which God's people are destined to suffer in this life are to be viewed in connection with the dispensation of grace, and the probationary state of mankind. This life is not one of complete reward, but of trial; and the blending of temporal sufferings with spiritual enjoyments is an economy best adapted to our condition in this world. Such a state of things presents affecting memorials of the evil of sin—of its hatefulness in the sight of God—and is designed to afford salutary and necessary admonitions against its influence. These sufferings, too, are so many tests of our patience, fidelity, and obedience. Moreover, they are accompanied with special grace, to render them subservient to our present spiritual welfare and our everlasting happiness.

If God allows some of the effects of sin to be suffered for a time, his grace extracts the poison from them, and converts natural evils into spiritual blessings. Though we may have to drink the cup of sorrow, grace renders it medicinal. If afflictions are a rod, they are like Aaron's rod, that blossomed and bore fruit. If they are a fire severe and painful, they are purifying; and when God has tried his people, they shall come forth like gold. 'Tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope.' 'All things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are the called according to his purpose.' Indeed, under the economy of grace, sufferings as well as labours and sacrifices for Christ are made rewardable. For we know that these 'light afflictions, which are but for a moment, work for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.'

Even death itself, the immediate effect of sin, and emphatically the great enemy of man, is placed in the category of the believer's possessions and blessings. His sting is extracted,

and his power to hurt is effectually annulled. Though the body shall fall a victim to his stroke, the spirit shall at once triumphantly soar to the paradise of God; and the body itself, at a future day, rise to glory, honour, immortality, and everlasting life. Secure, therefore, in the covenant of God, and exulting in prospect of boundless and eternal felicity, the believer may exclaim, as he stands on the margin of the tomb, 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.' From these truths, so clearly unfolded in the Gospel, it follows that the sufferings we experience here militate not against the free and full justification of a sinner by faith in Christ Jesus.

5. It is proper to observe that the blessing of justification has respect only to sins which are *past*. It cannot, in the nature of things, have any relation to *future* transgressions. It neither preserves us absolutely from falling into future sin, nor secures pardon for future offences. To do the former would close our state of probation, and destroy man's free agency; to do the latter would promote licentiousness, and frustrate the design of the Gospel, which is to secure the holiness and obedience, as well as the happiness, of mankind. Justification is an experimental blessing, securing our pardon and salvation, so long as we retain it by a faith that worketh by love, and bringeth forth the fruits of holiness. But if we sin wilfully we lose it, we forfeit all the high privileges connected with it, and fall again into condemnation—a condemnation deeply aggravated by our ingratitude and baseness in slighting the goodness of God, and sinning against light and knowledge. 'When the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die.'—Ezek. xviii. 24. Hence the necessity of watchfulness and prayer—of working out our salvation with fear and trembling.

6. As it is possible to lose the blessing of justification, so it is possible to regain it when lost. It is an awful sin to

backslide from God, and believers are bound to guard against it with the greatest diligence; but the sin, though great, is not unpardonable. God is merciful even to apostates, and earnestly entreats them to return to repentance. 'O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God; for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity. Take with you words, and turn to the Lord: say unto him, Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously.' 'I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely: for mine anger is turned away from them.'—Hos. xiv. 1, 2, 4. David himself is a striking example both of the possibility of a justified man falling into sin, and of the gracious truth that the backslider may be restored. That he fell grievously is a matter of history; and that he was fully restored to the Divine favour is evident from God's own testimony, and from the rich experience and holy joys uttered in many of the Psalms penned by him after his restoration.

Having explained the nature of justification, we proceed to show the means by which it is obtained.

It is manifest that there can be only one *true* way of salvation; yet there are several modes which are held and advocated by men. One is salvation by works; another is salvation by the mere mercy of God, obtained through repentance; another is by a dead faith in the finished work and imputed righteousness of Christ; and the other is salvation by a living faith in the propitiatory sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ. A brief investigation will make it quite clear that the three former are the inventions of men, and as destructive as they are delusive.

1. That men are not justified by works is abundantly taught in the Scriptures. If justification be by works, it implies that men have such an inherent and practical righteousness as gives them a claim to God's approval; but Gospel justification is the justification not of the righteous, but, as Paul says, of '*the ungodly;*' not of him that claims it by works, but, as the same Apostle tells us, of him that '*worketh not;*' that is, has no works which give him a claim to God's favour. As Romaine observes: "Righteousness is a perfect conformity to the law. If it be tried by the *balance* of the sanctuary, it is full weight; if judgment be laid to the line, and righteousness to the plummet, it is quite upright; and if by the standard, it is full measure. There is no defect in it

of any kind. This is the righteousness of the law. It must be perfect and continual, failing in no one point; for the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God. And it is an adjudged case, that 'there is none righteous, no not one.'" All the Scriptures we previously adduced to show that man is a sinner, and that justification implies the *pardon* of sin, demonstrate that our salvation cannot be by works; for 'to him that worketh (fulfilleth the law) is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.' 'And if by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more of grace: otherwise work is no more work.' We cannot misunderstand this reasoning. If a man fulfil the law, he is no transgressor; and if no transgressor, he claims the Divine favour as a *right*, and is no debtor to mercy. But since it is an incontrovertible truth that man *is* a transgressor, it irresistibly follows that his salvation is impossible by works, and if it be at all effected it must be by grace. The law says, 'The man which doeth these things shall live by them;' but it declares also, 'he that offendeth in one point is guilty of all;' that is, he breaks from his allegiance to God; he rebels against the Divine authority; and, in the spiritual sense of the law, as applicable to the conscience and affections, he becomes guilty of all, and subject to the sentence, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.'

Such being the requirements and denunciations of the law, and such the condemned state of man as a sinner, it follows, that if he had ability to commence a course of obedience, and henceforth keep the whole law, he could not set up a claim to the Divine favour; for present obedience cannot *atone* for past transgression. It would be no more than the discharge of instant duty, and after all leave us unprofitable servants. Thus, the guilt we had previously contracted would remain unexpiated, and the sentence of death unrepealed. But the transgressor has not ability to perform this obedience. Sin has left him helpless as well as guilty. He therefore continues adding sin to sin, and the law can never rescue him, as it neither provides pardon for the past, nor offers grace to help in time to come. The Psalmist deprecated the idea of his destiny being determined by the law, exclaiming, 'Enter not into

judgment with thy servant: for in thy sight shall no man living be justified;' and St Paul, after an elaborate argument, says, 'Therefore we conclude that by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh living be justified, for by the law is the knowledge of sin.'

Various attempts have been made to show that those passages which declare man's inability to be justified by the law, refer not to the *moral*, but to the *ceremonial* law. The context totally overthrows such a notion. Take an example. When St Paul opposes the law to faith, and says, 'Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law,' it is clearly the *moral* law of which he is speaking; for in the preceding passage he describes all men as having broken it, and all as being condemned by it. He says, 'We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one.' 'Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.' It is sufficient to remark, that the Gentiles, never having been under the ceremonial law, could never be condemned by it. The law, therefore, which condemned the Gentiles was the moral law, and by this law neither Jews nor Gentiles could be justified.—Rom. iii. 9, 10, 28.

For purposes widely different from our justification was the law re-published to man. The law is the image of God's purity, and the visible expression of man's duty. To an innocent and holy being it is the ground of his continued acceptance with God. It was originally written upon the heart of man in Paradise, and obedience to it was the implied condition of his happiness; and if to man, in his sinful state, 'there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness (justification) would have been by the law.' But since man fell, it cannot answer this end. It is 'weak through the flesh,'—ineffectual through man's depravity and guilt. Yet it answers other important purposes. It reflects the spotless purity of the Divine nature; it proclaims the nature and obligations of holiness; it exhibits, as in a mirror, the deep and foul depravity of man, the enormity of his guilt, his dreadful condemnation, his helplessness and

wretchedness. Its re-publication on Sinai, amidst solemn displays of Jehovah's majesty, shows that its precepts, though broken, are not forgotten. They are still invested with the high authority of heaven, and enforced by the most solemn sanctions. Thus, though the law cannot *save*, it can *teach*, and teach us lessons we are loth to learn. 'The law entered that the offence might abound;' 'it was added, because of transgressions;' 'that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.' 'The law is,' therefore, 'our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.' It convicts and condemns us; it abases our pride; it exposes the filthy rags of our self-righteousness; it makes us conscious of our danger and misery; and it extorts the self-despairing exclamation, 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' It makes us ready to welcome the cheering instruction, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' The experience of Paul is a striking illustration of the convincing and condemning power of the law, and its tendency to show the lost and helpless condition of the sinner. He says, 'What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. . . . For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.'—Rom. vii. 7—12.

2. It is maintained by some that we are justified by the mere *mercy* of God on our repentance and return to obedience. Such a sentiment, however, is not only unsupported by the Scriptures, but is directly opposed to the plainest testimony of God's word. Justification is unquestionably either by the law or the Gospel; but the scheme before us is neither the one nor the other, but an incongruous mixture, made up of obscure and imperfect notions respecting both. A moment's consideration will expose its absurdity. If justification be by the *law*, there is no need for either mercy from God or repentance from the sinner; for it is due as a simple debt of justice. But

this has already been exploded. If justification be by the *Gospel*, repentance is only *one* condition, and faith, not works, is the other; and the mercy of God is bestowed, not without regard to the claims of justice, but in harmony with justice: and this is accomplished through the mediatorial death of Christ.

It is alleged that when the publican prayed in the Temple he simply implored mercy; yet his prayer was heard, for he went down to his house justified. We reply, the passage gives no intimation that the publican rejected the doctrine of propitiation; if he had, God would have rejected him, even as he rejected Cain. Though the particulars of this penitent's belief are not stated, yet the circumstances of his worship and the result, taken together, clearly prove that the publican *did* believe in the doctrine of the propitiation. This was the doctrine of the Old Testament Scriptures, with which, as a penitent worshipper, we may reasonably suppose he was familiar. The publican's prayer, briefly as it is given, shows that he had no dependence either upon his works or his tears for acceptance. He smote upon his breast and cried for mercy, and that mercy he sought in God's appointed way, and that way is through an atonement. The word employed in his prayer, as Dr Clarke observes, is indicative of this. He said *hilastheti* (ἱλάσθητι), which may be rendered—*Be propitious* toward me, *through sacrifice.* It is the same word as is elsewhere rendered—*To atone*, to make *expiation* for sin; and from which the words ἱλάσμος and ἐξιλασμος are derived, which we have previously shown, in a multitude of cases, are rendered *the atonement*, or propitiatory sacrifice. It should be remembered, too, that this prayer was offered *in the temple*—the very place where sacrifices were daily offered, and where the mercy-seat was sprinkled with the propitiatory blood. It is not improbable that the priest was at that moment presenting the sacrificial victim; or, what is equally probable, that the publican himself had, according to the prescribed custom, brought his sin-offering before the Lord, and the priest was presenting the oblation on the altar at the moment that the penitent's prayer was ascending to heaven for pardon.

The Scriptural plan of salvation knows nothing of the merit of human works; nothing of the exercise of mercy at the

expense of justice; and nothing of repentance, as available to salvation, without faith in the death of Christ. Our Lord, it is true, declares, 'Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish.' But he also asserts, 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' He proclaims, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me.' The Apostle declares, 'We are justified by his blood;' and that 'we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.' 'Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.' The meaning of these, and of a host of similar passages, has been largely investigated and unfolded in the argument on the atonement of Christ. The establishment of that doctrine demonstrates the falsehood of the hypothesis we are controverting; and irresistibly proves that, while justification is obtained *for* us by the death of Christ, this blessing can be obtained *by* us only through a principle which recognizes the propitiatory character and object of the Redeemer's sacrifice as the only procuring cause of our salvation.

3. Another mode contended for by some is the exercise of a mere speculative faith in what is called the 'finished work, or the imputed righteousness of Christ.' This scheme, like those we have just examined, is in perfect opposition to the teaching of the sacred writings. For, 1. A speculative faith, however correct in theory, is totally unavailing to salvation. This St James has clearly decided, by affirming that 'faith without works is dead.' Even 'as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.' The faith that saves must be that of a penitent: hence repentance is made as essential to salvation as faith; and wherever faith is mentioned alone, or without any other qualification or condition, it must be understood that genuine repentance is included. 2. The method we are combating is erroneous in theory also, for the Scriptures nowhere recognize the imputed righteousness of Christ. It is certain that the words 'the imputed righteousness of Christ' never occur. We do, indeed, read of right-

eousness being imputed to us without works, but then it is 'the righteousness of faith,' and the simple meaning is this: that, being destitute of any *legal* righteousness to merit God's favour, our faith in Christ is accepted in its stead—is counted to *us* for righteousness, even as it was to Abraham. And in the same sense does St Paul use the word when he expresses a desire to be found in Christ, not having his own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.—Phil. iii. 9.

It is true that Christ had a legal righteousness. He perfectly fulfilled the whole law of God, in all its length and breadth, and depth and height; but this righteousness is not imputed to us as a substitute for personal holiness and obedience. Yet it was necessary to give perfection to Christ's character and work as our Saviour. His perfect obedience was necessary to magnify and honour, in human nature, that holy law which man had broken; to present a perfect and spotless example to his people; to demonstrate his own purity of nature and character, and consequently his moral fitness to be an acceptable and effectual atonement, by offering himself as a Lamb without blemish and without spot. For such purposes the active obedience of our Lord was as necessary in the economy of redemption as his death and resurrection. But the Scriptures nowhere teach that his obedience is placed to our account, or made a substitute for personal holiness and obedience to God. Nor is it necessary; seeing the atonement purges our guilt, and the Holy Spirit is promised to renew us in righteousness and true holiness, that we may perfectly love and worthily magnify God's holy name.

4. It follows that a living faith is the means or instrument of a sinner's justification. Now, faith is belief in, and dependence upon, Christ. The faith that justifies must be characterized by these three qualifications:—It must be associated with true repentance; it must be specially directed to Christ as its object; and it must include trust or reliance on him alone. Hence, when the trembling gaoler inquired, 'What must I do to be saved?' the Apostle said, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' He testified to both Jews and Greeks 'repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.'

We remark, faith must be associated with true repentance. When it is said that God justifieth the '*ungodly*,' it is not meant that a man may cherish the love and indulge in the practice of sin at the instant when he is justified; but that he is '*ungodly*' in this sense—that, having lived in the practice of ungodliness, he has no legal righteousness by which he can claim the Divine favour; that having broken God's law, he is justly exposed to its penalty; and therefore, if God were to lay judgment to the line and righteousness to the plummet, he would be condemned and punished, instead of being justified. Again, when it is said that God 'imputeth righteousness to a man without works,' it is not intended that the evangelical work of repentance and reformation should be excluded, any more than faith, for all these God requires, and without them no man can be saved. The meaning is, as previously intimated, that no man has such works as would give him a legal claim to the Divine favour; and, therefore, without any such claim, God justifies the man who exercises a scriptural faith, for his faith stands in the place of a perfect righteousness, and is imputed to him as such. But this scriptural faith is associated with genuine repentance. No uniform standard as to the depth and extent of repentance is prescribed. Provided it be such a repentance as leads to sorrow for sin and a renunciation of it, this requirement of the Gospel is so far answered. The necessity for such a repentance is obvious; for without it, faith would be impious presumption, the authority of God resisted, and his grace turned into lasciviousness. It is, therefore, the faith of a penitent which is the instrument of justification.

Again, this faith must be *appropriate in its object;* that is, it must have an especial reference to the mediatorial character and work of our Lord Jesus Christ.

There is an important relation subsisting between the work of Christ and mankind, and that relation must be recognized. Man is a sinner; Christ is his Saviour. Man is lost; Christ came to seek and to save that which was lost. Man has transgressed God's holy law; Christ was wounded for his transgressions, and bruised for his iniquities. Man is condemned and accursed by the law he has broken; Christ has redeemed him from the curse of the law, being made a curse for him.

Man is exposed to everlasting death, for the wages of sin is death; Christ died that he might live, for the gift of God is eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Man is legally cut off from all intercourse with God; but Christ is the medium of access to the Father. He is the Mediator between God and man, and has opened a new and living way of access to him, by which all may come unto God. These blessings can be realized in no other way than *through Christ*, and through him because he is their sole procurer. There is, therefore, a moral necessity that our faith should have special respect to Christ in his character as a Saviour; for as his death, as a sacrifice for sin, is assigned as the only meritorious cause of our salvation, it is impossible our faith can be effectual unless it recognize the object of the Saviour's death. Hence, when the Apostle speaks of Christ being set forth as a propitiation, he speaks of 'faith in his blood' as the instrument, on our part, to render the propitiation effectual to our justification.

Therefore, whatever truths our faith may embrace, if we reject the mediatorial death of our Lord, we reject that which is essential to our justification; we reject God's plan of salvation. We are like the foolish builders, who rejected the foundation-stone which God had made the head of the corner. We stumble against that stone on which we ought to be built. Like the foolish Pharisees and Scribes, we go about to establish our own righteousness, not having submitted ourselves to the righteousness of God. Such unbelief excludes the soul from Christ and all the blessings he has procured, and those who cherish it are exposed to the unmitigated consequences of their sins, and there remaineth nothing for them but the doom of unbelievers—a fearful looking for of judgment and of fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.

This faith includes *dependence*, *trust*—a committing of the whole soul's interest into the hands of Christ as our Mediator and Saviour. Hence the Apostle says, 'I know in whom I have *trusted* (ᾧ πεπίστευκα); and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have *committed* unto him until that day.' Thus, believing in Christ is a solemn *committing* of the soul to him as an all-sufficient Saviour; it is confidence in his willingness and his ability to save, even to the uttermost, all that come unto God by him. And observe, a man is no longer

justified than while he continues to believe: for 'the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.' No matter what his works may be—his alms-giving to the poor, and his labours—if he cease to believe in the Saviour's death, he is dead while he seems to live—he is a decayed branch. Such is the connection between faith and salvation. 'He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.'

Saving faith, then, embraces Christ as a Saviour, and relies upon him as such. The penitent believer thankfully acquiesces in God's revealed method of forgiveness, and commits his whole soul to Christ as an Almighty Saviour, trusting in him for pardon and everlasting salvation. To him Christ is not one Saviour among many, but his *only* Saviour. He does not divide his confidence between Christ and his own works or his tears, but he trusts in him to the exclusion of every other object—to the renunciation of all confidence in any other means in respect to salvation. Christ is to him all and in all, and he glories in nothing but his cross.

Respecting this faith, we have further to observe that it works by love, and brings forth the fruit of holy obedience. It is not a cold, speculative assent—it is believing with the *heart* unto righteousness. The conscience, the will, and affections harmonize with the understanding, in the solemn act of the soul in consigning itself wholly to Christ; and, having embraced him, he counts all things but loss for his sake, desiring only to love him, to do his will, and be found in him; not having his own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.'

The man who thus receives Christ by faith is justified. He is as free from condemnation as if he had never sinned through the whole course of his history, and as secure of the Divine favour as if he had personally fulfilled the whole law; and if faithful to the grace given, shall as certainly realize the joys of heaven as the angels who inhabit the realms of bliss.

5. This has been God's mode of salvation through every dispensation of mercy to fallen man. Justification by faith is a system of recovery as ancient as the first promise of a Saviour. If Christ is 'the Lamb of God, slain from the

foundation of the world,' faith in him, in that character, has ever been the instrument of salvation. When the Apostle Paul seeks to illustrate this doctrine by example, he introduces Abraham and David, Old Testament saints, as distinguished patterns of justifying faith.

We are aware that the language of the Apostle James has been quoted against these views; but when his words are candidly examined, they are found to speak the same truth, and furnish additional evidence in support of this doctrine. The Apostle says, 'Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.'—James ii. 21—24.

Though, to a superficial reader, this phraseology may appear to contradict the teaching of Paul and the general strain of Scripture, an attentive consideration of the context and general scope of the argument will show there is no real difference. St James was combating the errors of the Antinomian, who makes void the law through faith, and turns the doctrines of grace into an occasion of licentiousness: St Paul was reasoning against the Pharisee, who trusts in a fancied merit of his own work, and despises the humiliating doctrine of the cross. Hence the different strain of argument adopted by each inspired teacher; and hence, though both employ the same terms, each uses them in a different sense. While Paul speaks of justification in the sense of pardon and acceptance, James uses the word in the sense of exemplifying or manifesting the sincerity of our profession; which, as we have already seen, is the sense of the term as employed by our Lord when he said, 'Wisdom is justified of her children.' Paul is speaking of justification before God; James of justification before men. This difference in the application of the term appears quite obvious; for, whereas the *pardon of sin*, of which Paul is speaking, is a transaction between the soul and God, of which no third person can be a witness, the justification of which St James is speaking is that which is made visible to men by cor-

responding actions. Hence he says, 'Show me thy faith without thy works, and I WILL SHOW THEE MY FAITH BY MY WORKS.' Then, in illustration, James refers to the most remarkable transaction in the life of Abraham, the offering of his son Isaac upon the altar: and by this act, he says, the patriarch was *justified*. But how *justified?* Certainly not by being pardoned at that time; for this blessing he received before he was circumcised—nay, before Isaac was born; in fact, about sixty years before the offering of Isaac on Moriah! But if Abraham's being justified by offering up his son does not mean that he was then pardoned, what does it mean? We reply, most evidently, that he then exemplified, or proved by his practice, the sincerity of his faith—demonstrated to the eyes of all the integrity of his profession—he showed his faith by his works, as St James challenges others to do, who boasted of the like principle, but abused the grace of God. As it was impossible for a man to obtain the pardon of sin by the merit of works, for he has none, so it was impossible for the sincerity of a man's profession to be demonstrated by his faith merely, because faith is an *invisible principle*. As the former must be obtained by faith, so the latter must be proved by works; and this is what each Apostle teaches.

As the two Apostles were thus speaking of a different *justification*, so they were each speaking of a different *faith*. The faith which Paul commends, and describes as efficacious and saving, is a vital principle—active, energetic, fruit-bearing; but the faith which St James condemns is described as 'dead,' being alone, not accompanied with repentance, and bringing forth no fruit of obedience; it is the faith of devils and wicked men—the bare speculative assent of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness. Hence he says, 'Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? . . . . For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.'—James ii. 19, 20, 26. It was impossible for Paul to commend and describe as saving that faith which St James says is '*dead;*' and it was impossible for St James to describe as '*dead*' the faith which Paul declared was saving.

As these two inspired writers were thus evidently speaking

of a different justification and of a different faith, so it follows that they were speaking of different *works*. The works which Paul describes as not securing justification are the works of legal righteousness, or works wrought with a view to fulfil the law, and thereby deserve the favour of God as a debt of merit; but as no man, since the fall, ever acquired such a righteousness, of course no man can be justified in such a mode; and if justified at all, it must be not in the character of a righteous man, but in the character of one unrighteous and ungodly, deserving wrath instead of meriting favour. In this sense he is saved or justified by faith '*without works*.' He renounces the plea of works, and exercises a penitent trust in Christ. But the works which St James *commends* are evangelical works, such as *follow* faith, and flow from it, and present a practical, visible evidence of the genuineness of our faith, and the sincerity of our profession. Such works are never urged by the believer as the ground of pardon, for this blessing was obtained *previously*;' but they are well-pleasing to our heavenly Father, as the fruits of faith, and evince to the world that we are indeed the children of God, because we keep his commandments and do his holy will. As the tree is known by its fruit, so a man's life is the public evidence of the state of his heart. St James, therefore, refers to the most conspicuous proof which the life of Abraham presented—his illustrious act of obedience in offering his son at the command of God; an act which showed that while he was strong in faith, and staggered not at the promise, he loved God with all his heart, and made the Divine will the sole rule of his life. In like manner, Rahab's hospitable reception of the spies evinced her belief in God's promise, and led her to abandon the claims of country and friends for the covenant blessings of Abraham's God.

From the evidence before us, the apparent discrepancy between the two Apostles vanishes. Employing, as they did, terms in a widely different sense, their opposite affirmatives and negatives involve no contradiction whatever. Indeed, on the great subject of justification without the merit of works, their agreement is not merely implied but expressed. The inability of man to be justified by the law, St James plainly teaches when he tells us that 'whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he

that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.' Thus he declares man to be in the same guilty and perishing condition, by the works of the law, as does the Apostle Paul. Here, then, we have perfect agreement. That the sinner must be justified by *faith*, James plainly teaches when he says, 'The Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God.' Now, this is the doctrine taught by St Paul, when he declares that our faith is counted or imputed to us for righteousness; and to sustain this doctrine, the identical passage from the Old Testament, furnishing the same example, is quoted by Paul as is quoted by James, Rom. iv. 3, 22—25. Here, again, is a verbal agreement. That St Paul, as well as St James, denounces a spurious faith, and contends for good works, is equally clear in every part of his writings. His epistles are fraught with admonitions against sin, with stern rebukes of hypocrisy, and earnest exhortations to personal holiness, constantly insisting upon the essential connection between faith and practical obedience. He says, 'Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.' Writing to Titus, he says, 'This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men.'—Titus iii. 8.

The fact that Abraham was justified by faith being established, it follows that all the Old Testament saints obtained that blessing by the same means. They could not, indeed, have the same amount of spiritual light as we enjoy; but they had, we doubt not, much more light than is commonly supposed. The Old Testament history is brief, but the intimations which are scattered through both the Old and New Testaments show that patriarchs, prophets, and righteous men of former dispensations had a knowledge of the great principles of redemption, and believed them to the saving of their souls. They undoubtedly knew that a great and glorious personage as the Saviour was to come, and that that Saviour would take upon him human nature; for the first promise informed them that he was to be the Seed of the woman. They knew that this Saviour

was to *suffer*, for the same promise declared that his heel should be bruised. They knew that his sufferings would be *vicarious*, for this was exhibited in all their sacrifices; and they knew that his sufferings would result in man's salvation. The humble, penitential belief of these truths brought peace of conscience, communion with God, and joyous hope of a glorious immortality. Abel, in acknowledgment of his faith in these truths, brought the firstling of his flock, and 'obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts.' In the cordial belief of these doctrines of reconciliation, Enoch received the testimony that he pleased God; and Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord, while a guilty world lived in unbelief, and finally perished in a tempest of deserved wrath. The faith of patriarchs and prophets is a most interesting subject, but our limited space prevents enlargement. Brief as is the testimony of these holy men, it is full of Christ. Hence, when our Lord sought to instruct his disciples respecting the vicarious object of his death, he began at Moses and all the prophets, and expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself. To Him gave all the prophets witness. They enjoyed the same salvation as ourselves, and obtained it by the same means—faith in the Redeemer. *They* believed in the Saviour who had to come; *we* believe in the Saviour who has come. They believed in the Saviour *promised*; we believe in the Saviour *given*. The object of faith was the same under every dispensation, and reliance on Him brought salvation to every believer; for he is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

The Gospel method of justification by faith in Christ is every way worthy of God, presenting a vivid manifestation of his wisdom and goodness. To the self-righteous and worldly-minded it is now, as of old, a stumbling-block; and to those elate with philosophic pride, whether in ancient or modern times, it is foolishness; but, to the humble believer, it is the power of God and the wisdom of God. Though much of its glory, too bright for mortal vision, is reserved for the revelations of a future state, yet sufficient is seen, even now, to inspire the highest admiration and gratitude.

1. It is adapted to man's helpless condition. While the atonement, as the *procuring* cause of our justification, is adapted

to meet our guilt, faith, as the *appropriating* instrument, is adapted to our impotency. The requirement to *believe*, as a condition of our pardon, is as simple as the requirement to *behold* was to the perishing Israelites. They were dying from the envenomed wounds inflicted by the fiery serpents. Had God restored them without means, there would have been no visible connection between his agency and their recovery, and consequently no recognition of God, and no gratitude to him. And had God required them to perform an effort which demanded much physical exertion, the demand would have exceeded their ability. But, though dying, they could *look;* and one languishing glance at the brazen serpent was enough. It implied belief in God's remedy, and acquiescence in God's means, and it sufficed. At once the poison was counteracted, and death was arrested; departing life returned; health was restored; and their own instrumentality, however feeble, was connected with God's power and mercy in the event. So, in reference to our soul's salvation. Had God imposed no conditions, such a proceeding would have been incompatible with God's government and man's free agency. Had he imposed other conditions, they would have been inadequate or impracticable. Had he, for instance, required a moral righteousness as a qualification, it could never have been acquired, and we must have first despaired and then perished. Had certain acts of mortification or penance been required before justification, sickness or sudden death might intervene and prevent their accomplishment. But faith is a simple act of the mind, and by the aid of the Spirit, which is always ready to help, may be performed in a moment; and in a moment the blessing of justification be enjoyed. Salvation is everywhere offered as a *present* blessing, and the prescribed condition of simple credence in God's testimony corresponds therewith. It requires neither gigantic intellect, nor high attainments in learning, nor any other condition which places salvation out of the reach of any human being, or postpones it one moment of time. We need it *now*—it is procured *now*—it is offered *now*—we may obtain it *now*. In a moment the dying thief received it; immediately the penitent publican received it. At once the Ethiopian eunuch believed the report, and went on his way rejoicing; and the trembling gaoler, though at midnight a heathen, and in

design a suicide, before the morning dawned was a justified believer—a rejoicing son of God, and an heir of everlasting life. He rejoiced, believing in God with all his house. Hence ministers, without restraint or hesitation, may present to their hearers the blessings of a present salvation. While the audience listen to the message dropping from our lips, they may receive the glad tidings, believe with their heart unto righteousness, and enjoy the blessing of pardon. How graciously adapted to our perishing and helpless condition is the method of salvation by faith!

2. The adaptation of faith as the instrument of our justification appears in the fact that it is necessary to complete the soul's submission to God. It will be admitted that man can never be saved while in a state of resistance to God; but unbelief implies resistance. It is certainly the erecting of our own judgment against the testimony of God, and choosing our own way of salvation in preference to that which Divine wisdom has prescribed; and consequently it is equivalent to a rejection of the Saviour. A man may, in a certain sense, repent; he may be sorry for sin, because of the misery it has already entailed upon him, and the danger into which it has brought him; but this is not entire submission to God. A man may labour hard to procure the Divine favour by external deeds, but this does not imply entire submission to God; for pride of heart is always combined with the idea of human merit. The entire submission of the soul to God must include the surrendering of the understanding and judgment to his teachings, and the will to his control. Unbelief, on the contrary, keeps back the understanding, the judgment, and will, from that surrender. Hence the Apostle states, 'He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar.' That state of mind, therefore, which contradicts God's testimony and makes him a liar, can neither be a state of submission to God, nor one in which the fruits of the Holy Spirit can grow. Looking, therefore, at the intellectual and moral constitution of the human mind, we see the necessity of faith as the instrument of salvation. When the penitent believes in Christ, the submission is complete; there is not a faculty of the soul but which is prostrate; the last struggle of resistance is over; the soul is wholly committed to God; and his absolute right to dictate, to command, to

govern, is unreservedly acknowledged. This is the state of mind which prepares for future obedience, and for all the virtues which subsequently adorn and honour the Christian's life. As, therefore, the plan of salvation contemplates the holiness as well as the happiness of man, it is a proof of Jehovah's wisdom, as well as an expression of his benignity, in making faith the condition of our acceptance.

3. The adaptation of faith is manifest, as it unites the soul to God. The union of the soul to its Maker is necessary to our spiritual vitality, strength, and happiness; and it is the object of the Gospel to restore man to that union with his Maker which sin has cut off. But confidence is the basis of union. Between two human minds there can be no union without confidence. However intimately two minds may resemble each other, in taste, pursuits, habits, yet distrust would repel them, and keep them asunder. It was unbelief which separated man from God at first, and was the sad precursor of that train of woes which speedily followed. Had man never believed the Tempter's lie, he would never have fallen: had he never withdrawn his confidence from God, he would never have been severed from him. Thus faith is the restoration of a lost principle. Hence the Divine philosophy which requires its restoration. As man fell by unbelief, he must be restored by faith. 'He that believeth shall be saved.' He must go back to the point from which he has apostatized, and re-transfer his confidence from the malignant spirit of darkness to the God of love. Then, and not till then, can he be united to him. When the humble penitent reposes his confidence in Christ, all darkness and distance are annihilated, and he is made one with Christ, as Christ is one with the Father and the Holy Spirit. Hence, believing is represented by our being *in* Christ—living in him, dwelling in him, abiding in him. 'Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me (*severed from me*) ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.' —John xv. 4—6.

4. Justification by faith is promotive of humility. If man were saved by works, he would have whereof to glory; he would necessarily be elated by a sense of his own merit. If saved by repentance, he would imagine that his tears had made satisfaction for his guilt, and regard his restoration to Divine favour as a blessing he had a right to claim at the hand of his Maker. Such sentiments could only engender a spurious piety, in which humility, gratitude, and reverence could have no share; formality itself would only spring from corrupt principles, and the slender restraints of an external profession would be constantly broken by the strength of unsubdued depravity. The monstrous dogma of the works of supererogation, and the traffic in indulgences, are only ripe developments of the doctrine of justification by works. God, who knows what is in man, has adapted his plan of mercy to our necessities, and to hide pride from man, has cut off all occasion of boasting. The act which brings salvation is one which excludes from man all claim to a single meritorious work, and compels the sinner to feel and acknowledge his wretchedness, his guilt, his poverty, his absolute dependence upon God. It stops the mouth of every boaster, and prostrates the soul before the cross of Christ.

5. Justification by faith generates hatred to sin. Every other imaginable scheme makes sin comparatively a trifle; for what proportionate views of the malignity of sin can that man have who imbibes the notion that he can wash away its turpitude by a few tears, or make ample atonement by an observance of a few duties? Or if man were pardoned by the exercise of mere prerogative, what views could be entertained respecting the rectitude of those laws which man is permitted to violate with impunity, or the equity of those threatenings which God arbitrarily sets aside? Such doctrines are well fitted to loosen all moral obligation, to throw down the guards of moral order, and encourage universal rebellion. But the method of justification by faith in the crucified Saviour makes sin appear exceeding sinful. It presents to the mind the most impressive views of the perfection of God's holiness, the honour of his law, the order and stability of his government, with the baseness, ingratitude, and hatefulness of sin, and the certainty of its punishment being inflicted upon the finally impenitent.

These great principles are embodied and held forth in the cross of Christ, and faith brings the mind into immediate contact with them. The dignity of the Saviour's person—the innocence and holiness of his character—the degradation to which he stooped—the intense and awful agony he endured—the object for which he suffered—namely, to redeem mankind from sin, and the moral necessity which existed for his suffering for such a purpose, all combine to fill the mind with the deepest disgust and abasement on account of the enormity of sin, with the most profound respect for the requirements of the Divine law, and the greatest veneration for the Lawgiver. The faith which justifies brings the soul of the believer into the habitual contemplation of those great truths which impress the mind with these sentiments, and generate habits of holiness and obedience to God. When temptation is presented, faith destroys its power to fascinate. In view of the cross, the believer recoils with horror from the contact of sin, exclaiming, 'How can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?' He can no more sin than he can insult the Redeemer who groaned beneath its curse. He can no more sin than he can dare that flaming sword of justice, which was sheathed in the immaculate soul of Christ. Whatever aspect sin may assume, whatever attractions it may present, and whatever interests it may promise, it is in his view a monster, a pestilence, a moral contagion, and he flees from it with the utmost decision and abhorrence.

6. Justification by faith exalts the Saviour, and inspires the soul with the highest gratitude and love to him. On the contrary, salvation by works makes man his own saviour; and salvation by mere mercy degrades the Lord of Glory from a Saviour into a mere teacher. But these false systems are known to be spurious by their fruits; while they cannot harmonize with the work assigned to Christ in the Scriptures, neither can they generate those sentiments and emotions which apostles and prophets cherished respecting the Saviour of men. Pharisaism and Socinianism unite in exalting man and depreciating the Son of God; and both thus contradict the blessed gospel, and operate in opposition to its designs. It has been justly remarked by an eminent writer, 'If we would not have the ivy to creep on the ground we must erect an object which

it can embrace, and by embracing, ascend: and if we would detach the heart from embracing the dust, we must give it to another and a nobler object.' Faith in Christ, as our justifying Saviour, does this. It places before us an Almighty Redeemer, and unites the soul to him, and by this union elevates and purifies our nature. It exhibits a display of the richest condescension and love, and stimulates the soul by the most powerful obligations and exciting motives. The whole difference between Saul of Tarsus the Pharisee, and Paul the apostle of Jesus Christ, was owing to the different views and sentiments he entertained respecting justification. When he sought justification by works, he was proud, self-righteous, sanguinary, a despiser of Christ, a hater of his people. When he obtained justification by faith, he was humble, loving, self-denying, spiritual, full of love to Christ, and ready to lay down his life for the saints. The apostles seem at a loss for language to express their estimate of the Saviour's excellence and glory, and their sense of obligation for his transcendent love. 'Unto you which believe,' says Peter, 'he is precious.' 'We love him because he first loved us,' says the Apostle John. 'The love of Christ constrains us,' says Paul. The whole Church on earth exclaims, 'Unto Him that hath loved us, and washed us from our sins, be glory and dominion for ever.'

Thus love to Christ is the great principle of obedience, and under its influence his will becomes our law, his word our oracle, his example our pattern, and his glory the great end of our existence.

> 'Talk they of mortals, O thou bleeding Lamb!
> Thou maker of new morals to mankind,
> The grand morality is love of thee.'

Such views of the adaptation of God's method of salvation by faith illustrate his wisdom and goodness, and demand our ardent gratitude and praise. Had there been no visible reasons why God required man thus to believe, as the condition of pardon, it would have been our duty to believe; but when these reasons are so obviously apparent, the guilt of rejecting Christ becomes immensely aggravated.

7. Continuance in faith is essential to our continuance in a justified state. God says, by the prophet Habakkuk, 'The just shall live by faith, but if any man draw back, my soul

shall have no pleasure in him;' clearly implying that, as we received the blessing of justification by faith, it can only be retained by the same divine principle. To withdraw our confidence from Christ is to withdraw from the covenant of peace, and to forfeit all its blessings: it is to leave the city of refuge, and expose ourselves to the fatal stroke of the manslayer: it is to go back to Sinai and dare the curses which it fulminates against our guilty heads. Hence we are exhorted to stand fast, to fight the good fight of faith, to hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering.

There is the same necessity for *continuing* to believe in Christ as our Saviour, and depending wholly upon him for pardon, as there was at the period when we first received the blessing of justification. However high our attainments in holiness, however ardent our love, or uniform our obedience, we are still equally dependent upon Christ for salvation. We have no justification but through his blood, no access to the throne of grace but through his name, no claim to any covenant blessing but through his death and intercession, no spiritual strength or fruitfulness but in him; hence we are placed under the blessed necessity of being continually united to Christ by faith. Faith is the bond of union and the instrument of blessing. Such an economy proclaims the Divine goodness. God knows our propensity to wander, and he thus constrains us to abide in him. He knows our disposition to assume independence, and he curbs it by making our peace and happiness dependent upon resting and relying wholly upon him. He knows the creature is neither safe nor happy but as he leans upon and dwells in the Creator, and therefore he sweetly draws us to himself, and, so far as moral motives can operate, compels us to cleave to him. All man's misery has resulted from his separation from God, and that separation commenced in unbelief: all our happiness begins with our being re-united to him by faith; and the perpetuity of our safety and happiness for time and eternity is contingent upon the exercise of an humble, loving, and obedient dependence upon the Lord Jesus Christ. 'Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.'—Ps. ii. 12.

CHAPTER XI.

THE WITNESS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

As a creature accountable to God for my conduct, and destined to a future state of existence, where I must live for ever, either in the enjoyment of Jehovah's favour, or in the agonies of his displeasure, it is to me a question of the highest moment and solemnity, 'Am I now in the favour of God, and an heir of everlasting life? Or am I under God's wrath, and consequently exposed to eternal punishment?' A question involving such tremendous consequences cannot but awaken in every reflecting mind the deepest anxiety; and it must be of the utmost importance to resolve this solemn inquiry. But it is clearly beyond the province of unassisted reason to furnish a definite and satisfactory answer.

Human reason alone, indeed, cannot determine whether or not sin can be forgiven at all, either in this world or in the world to come. It can explore the arcana of Nature, and trace many of Nature's effects to their proximate causes, and thus demonstrate the connection, dependence, and harmony subsisting in the phenomena around us. It can accumulate proofs of the wisdom, power, and goodness of God; but it cannot solve the question, *How can a sinner be saved?* or even determine whether the pardon of sin be compatible with the administration of God's moral government. Nature is the only volume of the mere philosopher, and its ample pages do not reveal one line of pardoning mercy. Visible effects reveal an invisible, independent, eternal, and self-existing Cause. The immensity of God's works proclaims his almighty power. The variety and harmony, the beauty and magnificence of Nature, with the minute adaptation of every means to its respective end, declare his infinite wisdom; the bounteous provision made to supply the wants and promote the happiness of God's creatures exhibits his goodness; and the connection between happiness and virtue on the one hand, and vice and misery on the other hand, intimates his justice and holiness. But throughout the universe not a ray of pardoning mercy is seen;

not a whisper of Divine forgiveness is heard. An ominous silence prevails on this subject; a silence portending judgment rather than mercy, and more likely to awaken than to allay the sinner's fears. Hence, in all countries and ages, mankind have had recourse to costly sacrifices, painful penances, and degrading superstitions, in order to atone for their sins and propitiate the offended Deity. But neither the efforts of gloomy superstition nor the refined speculations of philosophy could establish a conviction that sin was forgiven, or relieve the labouring mind of its anxiety. After the utmost efforts the mind could find no solid foundation for peace and security, but was left to fluctuate amid anxious conjectures, agitated with alternations of hope and despair. The philosophic Earl of Chesterfield (apparently regarding only the deductions of reason upon the principles of natural religion) observed, 'The attribute of mercy which gives us comfort cannot make us forget (nor ought it) His justice, which must mingle some fears with our hope.' The Apostle, speaking of the gloomy apprehensions of mankind in general, says that 'through fear of death men were all their lifetime subject to bondage.'—Heb. ii. 15.

But what 'the wisdom of this world' could not discover, revelation has made plain. In the Gospel, God has made known his character, not only as just and holy, and therefore abhorrent to all iniquity and hostile to all transgressors, but as merciful and gracious, pardoning iniquity, transgression, and sin. Here, a method of salvation is made known, by which Jehovah can, without any compromise of his character, pardon the penitent and restore him to favour. Here, too, it is further declared to be our glorious privilege *to know* that we are pardoned and made God's adopted children.

It is reasonable to suppose that since God pardons the penitent and receives him into his favour, he would by some means impart to him the knowledge of his acceptance. To withhold this knowledge until the day of judgment, would leave the mind a prey to endless anxieties, and prevent those motions of ardent gratitude and filial joy which give cheerfulness and delight in the duties of religion. True, to communicate to a vile sinner a sense of Divine approval is an act of marvellous condescension, but not too marvellous for that God

who gave his Son. The bestowment of this gift involves condescension and mercy so vast and wonderful, that reason itself may infer, without presumption, his willingness to impart any other blessing necessary to the true happiness of man.

The Scriptures assert this important doctrine. They proclaim that the great object of the Gospel is to give the *knowledge* of salvation to God's people, by the remission of their sins. —Luke i. 77. They abound with examples of those who have realized this knowledge. 'Abel obtained witness that he was righteous'—that he was justified and accepted—'God testifying of his gifts.' Enoch walked with God, and enjoyed a testimony that he pleased God. Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord, and was preserved in the ark, while an impenitent and unbelieving world was destroyed. David rejoiced in the blessedness of the man whose transgressions are forgiven and whose sins are covered; and he clearly describes his own happy transition from the anguish of a guilty conscience to the enjoyment of Divine favour. He says, 'When I kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all the day long. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me: my moisture was turned into the drought of summer.' But, 'I acknowledged my sin, and my iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.'—Ps. xxxii. 3—5. Thus, the Psalmist was now as conscious of pardon as he had previously been of guilt. The penitent publican, after confession and prayer, went down to his house justified. The trembling gaoler trusted in Christ, and then rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house. The two states of mind here described present a striking contrast —trembling and rejoicing: the former the result of guilt, the latter of pardon. The gaoler was now as conscious of the latter as he had been of the former. All the Apostles were filled with the Holy Ghost, and enjoyed a clear and indubitable evidence of the Divine favour; and this blessing they describe as the common privilege and inheritance of believers. The Apostle John confidently speaks of this blessing as enjoyed by himself and all true Christians: 'Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God! Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he

shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.'—1 John iii. 1, 2. St Paul expresses the same consciousness of the Divine favour, and the same joyous confidence of everlasting blessedness. 'For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.' 'For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better.'—2 Cor. v. 1, 5—8; Phil. i. 21, 23.

That this consciousness of Divine acceptance, and this joyous hope of heaven, are the common inheritance of believers, is evident from such declarations as the following: 'And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.'—Gal. iv. 6, 7; iii. 26. Writing to the Romans, the same glorious privilege is set forth with additional clearness and force. 'For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ.'—Rom. viii. 14—17. All spiritual gifts were not possessed by the primitive believers in common, but were distributed, some to one, and some to another. Hence, the Apostle asks, 'Are all workers of miracles? have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?'—1 Cor. xii. 29, 30. The Corinthians knew they did not all possess these gifts. But no such distinction or difference is marked in reference to the gift of pardon and adoption. On the contrary, the Apostle says, 'Ye are all the children of God by faith.'—Gal. iii. 26. And St John, addressing believers generally, says, 'I write unto you, little children, because your

sins are forgiven you.' Thus the pardon of sin, and the knowledge of it, was the privilege of all, even of little children—babes in Christ Jesus. The passages before us present a clear view, both of the blessed relation in which the believer stands to God, and his knowledge of that relationship.

I. His relation is that of a son. He is not only pardoned and delivered from the penal consequences of sin, but he is adopted—made a son of God. Adoption is an ancient practice, and has obtained in all countries. It is the act of a person taking a child into his family, and treating him in all respects as his own. Thus Moses was adopted by Pharaoh's daughter, and Esther by Mordecai. When a sinner is pardoned, he is adopted into God's family, and treated in all respects as one of his children. All the holy intelligences in heaven are God's children, and every believer is added to his numerous, happy, and dignified family. As a child of God, he is called by a new and honourable appellation, expressive of his Divine relationship; he is an object of his Father's love; he has free access to his presence and the throne of his mercy; he shares his protection and care; and he is constituted an heir of his glory: for, as St Paul says of believers universally—'If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ.' Surely in this statement the Apostle has reached the limit of human language, as of human privilege. In clearness, in fulness, in force of expression, nothing can exceed this:—'Heirs of God'—of the Deity himself. How comprehensive the phrase!—how wonderful the privilege! 'Joint-heirs with Christ.' How unequivocal the title! Is the human nature of the Saviour entitled to eternal fruition?—does his inherent purity and perfect obedience give him a legal claim to heaven, and his voluntary sufferings enhance that claim?—equally secure, though based on different ground, is the believer's title to heaven, for he is 'a joint-heir with Christ.' As our elder Brother, as well as our Lord and Saviour, Christ is gone to take possession of our eternal inheritance; and all the members of the glorified family he will finally place in possession of the mansions he has prepared.

II. We have next to inquire, What is the nature of the evidence afforded to the mind of the believer as to this exalted relation, and from what source is it derived? Is it by a vision,

or a voice from heaven, or some external manifestation? Not any such means are essential, nor are they made subjects of promise; yet in some special instances such evidence has been given. Thus, when God approved of Abel's offering, and testified that he was righteous, there must have been some external manifestation, for it was witnessed by Cain and excited his envy. God blessed Noah, and showed him his favour. He said to Abraham, 'Fear not: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.' The seraph said to Isaiah, 'Lo, thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is purged.' Gabriel said to Daniel, 'O man greatly beloved, fear not: peace be unto thee, be strong, yea, be strong.' The angel testified to Mary, 'Fear not: for thou hast found favour with God.' The Saviour said to the penitent woman who bathed his feet with her tears and wiped them with the hairs of her head, 'Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.' To the prayer of the dying thief, he replied, 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' In these instances, and others of a like nature, there was an audible reply, or a visible manifestation, giving an assurance of Divine favour; and in ages since those periods God may have indulged others with a like testimony. But such are extraordinary cases, and are never made subjects of general promise, and consequently are not to be expected.

In a passage already quoted (Rom. viii. 16) St Paul shows that the mode of the believer's assurance is by an *inward* persuasion or impression, not an *outward* manifestation. A testimony addressed not to our bodily senses, but to our consciousness. Hence he says, 'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.' These words clearly teach us that the evidence of our adoption is *twofold*—the witness of the Holy Spirit, and the witness of our own spirit. This meaning lies upon the surface of the passage, and is so obvious that we wonder that any theologian should have attempted to reduce the testimony to that of one agent—namely, the testimony of our own spirit. Certainly 'the Spirit itself,' which bears witness with our spirit, is as distinct from our own spirit as two men deposing evidence in a court of justice are two distinct beings. The Greek word employed expresses the conjoint testimony of two distinct agents. It is not μαρτυρεῖ, which means simply, *He* bears witness, and which

is used where the testimony is single; but it is the compound *συμμαρτυρεῖ*, which literally expresses a *conjoint* testimony, and implies *plurality* of witnesses agreeing and supporting each other by their united deposition. Take another example of the same word in the following chapter:—'I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also (*συμμαρτυρούσης*) BEARING ME WITNESS in the Holy Ghost.' The conscience of the Apostle and the Holy Ghost were two distinct agents, but they unite in their testimony to the fact asserted by the Apostle; and the compound form of the same verb is used with the design to express the agreement of their distinct but united testimony. On the same principle the witness of the Holy Spirit itself, in reference to our adoption, is distinct from, though united with, the witness of our own spirit. Since then there are two witnesses, it will be necessary to examine the testimony of each separately, and afterwards show their harmony and relative importance.

1. We begin with the witness of the Holy Spirit. That by the phrase 'the Spirit itself' is meant the Holy Ghost, the glorious Being who is commonly denominated the Third Person in the Godhead, and whose name is associated with the Father and the Son in the sacred rite of Baptism, is evident from the context. In Rom. viii. 9, the Apostle, speaking of the state of believers, says: 'Ye are not in the flesh, but in the SPIRIT, if so be that the SPIRIT OF GOD dwell in you. Now if any man have not the SPIRIT OF CHRIST, he is none of his.' Nothing can be clearer than that Paul is here speaking of the Holy Ghost, which he calls, indifferently, either the Spirit of God or the Spirit of Christ, because of the essential union subsisting between the Father, the Son, and Spirit. This Spirit dwells in all the heirs of heaven, as the Apostle (in 1 Cor. vi. 19) says: 'What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?' In Rom. viii. 11, he teaches the same doctrine: 'But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.' This Spirit leads the people of God, for he adds: 'As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.' Now this same Spirit which dwells in the hearts of believers, and leads them in the path of obedience, the Apostle tells us is

that which enables us to cry, 'Abba, Father;' for he immediately asserts: 'THE SPIRIT ITSELF beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.' Thus, the connection shows us with the clearness of daylight, and the conclusiveness of a mathematical demonstration, that it is the Holy Ghost which is here referred to.

This truth invests the doctrine under consideration with unspeakable importance and value. For if the assurance of believers be given by the *Holy Ghost*, the evidence afforded must be infallibly certain. The testimony of our own judgment may be erroneous, and the declaration of an angel on such a subject might be suspected; but the testimony of the Spirit admits of no doubt or distrust, for it is the testimony of God himself. The act of pardon is the act of God alone, and no being but He who knows what passes in the mind of God is qualified to reveal the gracious tidings of pardoning mercy and love to the human soul. 'For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.'—1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. Many passages show that the Holy Ghost reads the hearts of men, but this shows that he knows all the mind of Deity. Even as the mind of man is conscious of its own thoughts and emotions, however deeply concealed from others, so the Holy Spirit penetrates into all the profound counsels, and comprehends all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge contained in the infinite ocean of the Eternal Mind. The Spirit, therefore, is competent, and he alone is competent to reveal to the human soul the solemn and interesting fact, that Jehovah's displeasure is turned away. This, therefore, is the office of the Holy Ghost. For the believer receives not the spirit of the world, but 'the Spirit which is of God; that he may know the things which are freely given to him of God.'

2. The kind of evidence which the Holy Spirit affords is called '*bearing witness*.' It will not be disputed that this language is appropriate and expressive; and if so, the evidence of our adoption must be such as is analogous to a testimony or direct proof. When John bore witness of Jesus, that he was the Messiah, he uttered a plain and direct testimony, saying, 'This is he of whom I spake, Behold the Lamb of God, which

taketh away the sin of the world.' When the Apostles bore witness to the resurrection of Christ, they exclaimed: 'This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses.' When the Father bore witness to the Son, he announced from the parted cloud—'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' And when the Spirit bears witness to our spirit, that we are God's children, although no vocal sound is heard, yet he exerts an influence upon the soul, equivalent to a direct testimony, declaring, 'Thou art pardoned and accepted through Christ. Thy sins are all forgiven, and thou art an adopted child of God.' As St Bernard says, 'The testimony given by the Holy Ghost in thy heart is this, "Thy sins are forgiven thee."' It is a witness; and though the testimony is internal, not external—addressed to our consciousness, not to our bodily senses—yet it is equally as distinct and as clearly recognized as if it were a vocal announcement from heaven. Indeed, vocal testimony is the figure employed to represent both his direct influence upon the heart, and the results of that influence. In one passage the Spirit itself is described as crying, 'Abba, Father;' and in another as causing the believer spontaneously to cry, 'Abba, Father.' In Gal. iv. 6, it is written: 'And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father;' and in Rom. viii. 15, it is said, we 'have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.' The words *Abba* and *Father* have the same meaning. The former is a Syriac word, and the latter is its literal translation. When the Spirit is said to cry 'Father' in the believer's heart, the meaning is, that his influence produces within us a consciousness that God is our reconciled Father, and we are his adopted children. When it is said that we by the Spirit cry 'Father,' the meaning is that the assurance he inspires of our sonship is so clear and full, that the soul spontaneously, as if by a spiritual instinct, addresses God as a child would address his father. The consciousness felt by the believer of this happy relationship cannot be expressed more appropriately, nor in more perfect accordance with the verbal teaching of inspiration, than it is by Wesley in the following stanza:—

'My God is reconciled,
His pardoning voice I hear;

He owns me for his child,
I can no longer fear.
With confidence I now draw nigh,
And Father, Abba, Father, cry.'

3. This witness of the Spirit is usually termed *direct* and *immediate;* and although these terms have been denounced, we conceive that they are in the strictest sense proper, conveying, as definitely as human language can do, the thing intended by the Holy Scriptures. The witness is direct and immediate, because it is given by God himself, and not by the intervention of another. It is not the testimony of a minister, or an angel, or merely the promise or declaration of the written word, but the testimony of God himself. The Scriptures expressly state, 'The SPIRIT ITSELF beareth witness with our spirit.' It is the personal presence of the Holy Ghost in actual contact with the human soul. It is a species of inspiration, as really and properly such as that which was given to prophets and apostles. The subject revealed is different, but it is a revelation, and a revelation as essentially Divine, and as much the result of the Spirit's immediate presence and agency, as the most remarkable predictions of the ancient seers. As no man could foresee the far distant events foretold in the Scriptures without the suggestions of inspiration, so no man can determine with absolute certainty that God has pardoned his transgressions, without the Spirit of adoption revealing it to his mind. This witness is indeed given to us while using means either of a public or private nature; for the use of religious means is our duty, and God honours them by making them the occasions when he bestows his blessings. It may be given while worshipping in the sanctuary, or in the closet; while reading the Scriptures, or singing a hymn, or commemorating the Saviour's death, or simply in meditation. But these are only *means* of grace, and not the grace itself. The witness imparted, the assurance enjoyed, is inspired by the Spirit itself. As the Apostle says, 'Hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.' 'Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.' 'It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth.' 'He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself.'—1 John iii. 24; iv. 13; v. 6, 10.

As this witness is direct and immediate, it cannot be the result of reasoning, or of any argumentative process. It is not a conclusion elaborated by self-examination and comparison, but a self-evident proposition, seen at once by the eye of the mind, as the sun is seen by the eye of the body. Our adoption is known in this instance by the simple testimony of the Spirit. We know it, not by reasoning upon our state, but by intuition; not by inference, but by consciousness. We know we are pardoned, because the Holy Spirit inspires the assurance. We know we are in God's favour, because we feel and enjoy it. We know we are adopted, because the Spirit of adoption testifies that we are the sons of God, and constrains us to cry, 'Abba, Father.' It must therefore be direct and immediate.

4. This witness of the Spirit excludes all doubt and distrust. Its gracious design is to deliver them who, through fear of death and the Divine displeasure, have all their lifetime been subject to bondage; and this it fully accomplishes. Hence the Apostle states, concerning those who enjoy this testimony, 'Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.' As light dispels darkness, and as joy excludes mental anguish, so the testimony of the Holy Ghost excludes tormenting and enslaving fear. It is not conjecture, but assurance; not probability, but certainty. It belongs to the highest class of evidence which our nature can perceive.

The evidence of some truths depends upon a chain of reasoning; and such kind of evidence ranges within a wide latitude, from the lowest probability to moral certainty. The evidence of another class of truths depends upon the testimony of our bodily senses, and this commands our unqualified assent. But another class of truths are known by consciousness, and these must, in their nature, be intuitive and self-evident. They are too obvious to be rationally doubted; they shine by their own light. Such truths, indeed, form the substratum on which the knowledge of all other truths is built. In illustration of these sentiments regarding different kinds of evidence, we remark—the proposition that a person named Julius Cæsar once existed, and invaded our country, is true; yet is not self-evident, for it requires a process of reasoning to produce a conviction of its truth. But the fact that the sun shines at noon-

day requires no proof, for my sight attests it. The fact that I exist requires no proof; it is self-evident; my consciousness assures me of it, and I cannot avoid assenting to it. So if the Spirit of God bear testimony to my spirit that I am his child, I am assured of it, because my consciousness of what passes in my own mind produces that assurance. I know it because I feel it. The evidence in this instance is in my consciousness, not in my reason.

If the soul is conscious of all its sentiments and emotions, by whatever cause they are produced, it must be conscious of the testimony which the Holy Ghost gives of our acceptance and adoption. If I fear, I know that I fear; my consciousness attests it. If I am happy, I know that I am happy; my consciousness attests it. So if the Holy Spirit produce in my mind a sense of pardon, I know and am assured of it by my own consciousness. This is the witness of the Spirit, and it clearly belongs to the highest class of evidence the soul can experience—an evidence which excludes all doubt, all fear, and all distrust. I may look to other sources for collateral evidence of the same thing, but all other evidence must be subordinate and inferior to this. The testimony of my own spirit must be inferior to the testimony of God's Spirit, and the evidence of reason must be inferior to that of consciousness. It is this experience of which the prophet speaks when, describing a state of conscious pardon, he says, 'O Jehovah, I will praise thee: though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortedst me. Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid; for the Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation.'—Isa. xii. 1, 2. The confidence of Divine favour here expressed excluded all doubt. It was as vivid and as certain as the previous state of wrath and displeasure had been. The state of wrath was felt—'Thou wast angry with me.' So the state of pardon was felt—'Thine anger is turned away, and thou *comfortedst* me.' The spirit of bondage had given place to the Spirit of adoption. 'Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid.'

This doctrine is taught in numerous passages of Scripture, as well as in those we have especially examined, and is represented in various instructive forms.

5. St Paul, speaking of believers, describes them as having

the love of God shed abroad in their hearts by the Spirit. He says: 'Hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.'—Rom. v. 5. The love which is here spoken of is a love of which we are the recipients; not properly the love which we exercise towards God, but the love which God exercises towards us, as his pardoned and adopted children. This love is not only testified and declared in the Scriptures, but is communicated to us: it is shed abroad in our hearts—given in large measure, so as to fill the soul. It is communicated by the Holy Ghost, and this is the mode by which he testifies, or witnesses, the favour of God. For what can be so clear a demonstration of God's loving regard to man, as the making of that love sensibly felt by man? It is, therefore, in strict accordance with the philosophy of the human mind that the Apostle states that, through the influence of this love, our 'hope maketh not ashamed.' For the hope of heaven is well founded, when it is based in the conscious possession of God's love. It is then not a conjecture, but a holy, enlightened, and authorized expectation, and it shall never be confounded or put to shame. It is this which distinguishes the hope of the believer from that of the hypocrite. The latter is hope without a Scriptural foundation or authority—a hope unsustained by the evidence of God's love in the heart. Such a hope is presumption, and shall perish as the spider's web.

6. The same Apostle declares that, 'being justified by faith, we have peace with God.'—Rom. v. 1. The peace here spoken of is not merely a cessation of hostility, for that had transpired before justification. The peace here intended is one coincident with justification, or which flows from justification. It is, in fact, a peace *felt*—a consciousness that God's displeasure is withdrawn—an assurance of his favour. It is, in other words, the witness of the Holy Spirit. In the absence of this peace with God there can be no witness of our adoption; and in the presence of this peace with God there can be no condemnation. This consciousness of peace, inspired by the Holy Ghost, is therefore God's testimony that we are forgiven and accepted through the Beloved. We may here remark that ecstacies and transporting joys are not essential to the witness of the Spirit. Sometimes,

indeed, the soul is borne away by rapturous enjoyments, but these are only occasional; and, perhaps, neither our nature nor our condition in this life is adapted to incessant transport. A consciousness of peace with God is the testimony of the Spirit; and this is the privilege of all believers at all times.

7. The testimony or witness of the Holy Spirit is elsewhere called the seal which God puts upon his people. 'In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were SEALED with that Holy Spirit of promise.' 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are SEALED unto the day of redemption.'—Eph. i. 13; iv. 30.

A seal or signature is a mode of attestation often adopted as evidence or proof of a thing, and of course men may give witness to any truth or fact by a seal or signature, as properly and as effectually as by vocal testimony. We have here the same doctrine inculcated under a change of figure. God attests our acceptance by impressing upon our souls a consciousness of his favour. A seal is also an impression, a mark fixed upon an object by its owner to denote his proprietorship. The love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost is his own seal upon the believer. It is an impression felt and seen by the believer, producing a consciousness that he is God's accepted child. It was customary among all nations, as Dr Clarke observes, that when a person purchased goods of any kind he marked with a seal what he had purchased, to signify that they were his own. So God sets his mark upon his people, not for his own sake, that he may be able to distinguish them, but that they themselves may have an assurance that they are his in deed and of a truth: this mark is his love shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost.

8. What is here termed the seal of the Spirit is in the same passages called the earnest of the Spirit. 'Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the EARNEST of the Spirit in our hearts.'—2 Cor. i. 21, 22. 'After that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the EARNEST of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.'—Eph. i. 13, 14. The word rendered 'earnest' is ἀρραβὼν (*arrhabon*),

and is pure Hebrew, ערבון, literally signifying a deposit, or something pledged or given as security until the principal be paid. The sealing of believers, St Paul says, is their earnest, their pledge of heaven, until the promise of eternal life be fulfilled. Now, what is the essence of heaven but the favour of God? 'In thy favour is life: in thy presence (thy favour) is fulness of joy'—or, as the Septuagint has it, and as it is quoted by St Peter—'Thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance: at thy right hand (in thy presence and favour) are pleasures for evermore.' If the essence and fulness of the bliss of heaven be the favour of God, what is its most expressive pledge or earnest but the love of God shed abroad in the heart? This, of itself, is the commencement of heaven—a foretaste of its bliss. Now, as this earnest of heaven is declared to be the privilege of believers while here, it furnishes additional proof that the witness of the Spirit means a direct and an immediate sense of the favour of God. Whether the blessing be represented as an influence constraining us to cry 'Abba, Father,' or as the seal of the Spirit impressing an evidence upon the soul, or as an earnest of the joys of heaven, the meaning is substantially the same, and the various imagery employed only serves to present the same blessing under its several interesting aspects. These several representations of the Spirit's testimony are embodied and beautifully expressed in the following stanzas by Dr Watts:—

'Dost thou not dwell in all thy saints,
And seal the heirs of heaven?
When wilt thou banish my complaints,
And show my sins forgiven?

'Assure my conscience of her part
In the Redeemer's blood,
And bear thy witness with my heart
That I am born of God.

'Thou art the earnest of his love,
The pledge of joys to come;
May thy blest wings, celestial Dove,
Safely convey me home.'

9. In the Old Testament also this doctrine is clearly taught, but we find it represented by a different kind of phraseology—a phraseology more conformable to the Hebrew idiom. It is commonly expressed by such phrases as 'the light

of God's countenance,' and 'the shining of God's face.' It will soon appear that these terms indicate substantially the same idea. The hiding of God's face from any one denotes his displeasure; hence, when Jehovah denounces his judgments against rebellious Israel, he says, 'Then my anger shall be kindled against them in that day, and I will forsake them, and I will HIDE MY FACE from them.'—Deut. xxxi. 17. On the other hand, the light of God's countenance, or the shining of his face, signifies his favour, his love. The Psalmist says, 'The righteous Lord loveth righteousness; his COUNTENANCE doth behold the upright.'—Ps. xi. 7. In the ancient benediction pronounced upon the people by the high priest, he prayed that God would make his face to shine upon them, and be gracious unto them: that he would lift up the light of his countenance upon them, and give them peace.—Numb. vi. 25, 26. Thus, the people were taught to expect this blessing as an experimental privilege. Throughout the Old Testament we find the 'light of God's countenance' frequently spoken of in connection with pardon and salvation, and made to express a sense of God's favour. Take the following examples:—David prays, 'Make thy FACE TO SHINE upon thy servant: save me for thy mercies' sake.'—Ps. xxxi. 16. Here, salvation and the shining of God's face are synonymous. When David deprecates God's displeasure against him, he prays, 'Hide not thy face from me;' but when he describes men enjoying a consciousness of Divine favour, he speaks of them as walking in the light of God's countenance, saying, 'Blessed is the people that know the joyful sound: they shall walk, O Lord, in the light of thy countenance. In thy name shall they rejoice all the day: and in thy righteousness shall they be exalted.'—Ps. lxxxix. 15, 16. To walk in the light of God's countenance is to enjoy an habitual sense of his favour. As the human countenance is an index of the mind, and as a kind, complacent look is a visible expression of favour which every eye can read, this figure is a vivid representation of the knowledge of salvation inspired by a sense of God's love in the heart. Again, the Psalmist prays, 'Turn us again, O Lord God of hosts, cause thy face to shine; and we shall be saved.' Here salvation and the discovery of God's reconciled countenance are connected, because the latter was a sensible expression of the former. The shining of his

face was of itself the evidence that he was to them the God of their salvation. In another psalm he prays, 'God be merciful unto us, and bless us; and cause his face to shine upon us.' His shining face is the evidence of his mercy; and it was for this inward manifestation the Psalmist so devoutly prayed. This inward revelation of God's pardoning love was estimated by him far above all earthly blessings—it was the sum of his happiness; for while the men of the world inquire for pleasure and gain, saying, 'Who will show us any good?' he concentrates all his desires in a prayer for one blessing, the favour of God—'Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us.' The fact that David prayed for this blessing is of itself a proof that he regarded it as a privilege which belonged to God's people, even under that dispensation. Certainly, such phrases as 'the light of God's countenance' are not employed to denote evidence elaborated by an inductive process, but a direct manifestation of God's love, as intuitively perceived by the eye of the mind, as the light of a sunny day is immediately perceived by the eye of the body.

The image of brightness and glory, used so frequently in the Old Testament to denote God's favour, was probably derived from the Shekinah—the visible symbol of God's presence. Sometimes this symbol of Jehovah's majesty shone with an overpowering brightness, as an indication of the Divine favour. When the tabernacle was set up in the wilderness, the glory of the Lord filled the place, so that Moses was not able to enter therein (Exod. xl. 34, 35). When the Temple was dedicated, 'the cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud: for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord.'—1 Kings viii. 10, 11. In this instance God came and visibly took possession of his sanctuary. Nor did this glory soon depart, but abode between the cherubim in the holy of holies, and, as it seems from the language of Scripture, occasionally beamed forth with excessive brightness. Hence the Psalmist says, 'Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, GOD HATH SHINED.' 'Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; thou that dwellest between the cherubims, shine forth.'—Ps. l. 2; lxxx. 1. These visible representations of the Divine presence and favour threw a solemn and delightful

interest over God's sanctuary and worship; hence, they are subjects of constant reference in the sacred writings, and very naturally became expressive images of God's manifested favour to his people. They were, indeed, intended to adumbrate the union betwixt God and his people, and the discoveries of his favour and love to the human soul. Hence, our bodies are said to be *temples of the Holy Ghost*. As the Shekinah dwelt in the sanctuary, God dwells in his people by his Holy Spirit; and as the radiance beamed forth from between the cherubim, the Holy Spirit shines in our hearts with a marvellous light, giving us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

All the representations of this doctrine we have examined clearly show that the Spirit's testimony is addressed directly to our consciousness. As a 'witness,' its voice proclaims our adoption; as a 'seal,' it is the royal impression of our Father's signet, attesting our acceptance; as an 'earnest' of heaven, it is a sense of his favour—the prelude of joys to come; as 'the love of God shed abroad in our hearts,' and as the light of his countenance, it expresses its own nature—a joyous sense of the approbation of God. In all this the evidence is not inductive, but manifested immediately to the soul.

While this gracious privilege is thus clearly unfolded, it does not follow that the people of God have always the same bright and joyous evidence of Divine favour. It does not even follow that they are always free from doubt and fear. The history of God's people in all ages shows that even his sincere and holy servants have, on some occasions, had their confidence shaken, and their souls involved in darkness and fear. But at such seasons the Spirit of God was not bearing witness with their spirit, that they were his children; and the absence of this witness must be ascribed not to any arbitrary or capricious proceeding on the part of God, but to some unfaithfulness on the part of man. God is faithful, unchangeable to his covenant engagements, and never leaves his people, even for a moment, while they are faithful to his grace. He may not always bestow the same measure of joy, but, undoubtedly, such a sense of his favour as excludes tormenting fear, and inspires at least a comfortable persuasion of our acceptance, he would constantly afford to our minds if, in all things, we walked according to his

will. The total absence, therefore, of the Spirit's witness must be the effect of some unfaithfulness on our part. We may have been unwatchful, or negligent, in some respects. We may have yielded to some temptation, and thereby grieved the Holy Spirit. We may not live so near to God as our duty demands. We may have obscure and inadequate views respecting our privileges, and respecting the plan of salvation; or we may not exercise that simple faith which the Gospel requires. Any of these causes is sufficient to account for the withdrawal of the light of God's countenance. The fault is not in God, but in ourselves. Let us, then, not lower our privileges down to our experience, but raise our experience up to our privileges. Let us not estimate the standard of our duties by our attainments, but exalt our attainments to all the blessedness which is provided for us in the gracious covenant of God.

The witness of the Holy Spirit does not imply the constant absence of all sorrow and grief. A Christian may be assured of the Divine favour, and yet realize deep and poignant sorrow on many accounts. He may sorrow as Jeremiah and Paul over the impenitence and unbelief of his countrymen. He may mourn over the deadness of the Church, the prevalence of impiety in the world, or the misery and danger of his own family. Such sorrow is quite compatible with the highest state of personal holiness, and the clearest manifestation of God's favour; and, indeed, the most faithful and devoted saints, being subject to the deepest concern for the souls of men and the honour of God, are the most liable to drink of this bitter cup. Such were the mingled feelings of Paul, who speaks of himself as being sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as having great heaviness and continual sorrow in his heart, on account of the unbelief of his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh.

In maintaining and defending a plain Scriptural truth, we are not required in justice to account for every case of apparent anomaly growing out of the peculiar state of individuals. Yet, as the question is sometimes asked, 'May not the absence of the Spirit's witness be accounted for in some cases solely by a constitutional tendency to mental depression?' it may not be out of place to give our views. We reply, constitutional depression may prevent the soul from exercising faith in Christ; and, as faith is the instrument by which we receive the Spirit's

witness, the absence of that instrument through depression will of course be the occasion of our being destitute of the Spirit's witness. As mental depression affects our perceptions generally, it will doubtless affect and distort our religious perceptions; and in instances deeply exacerbated, may so fix and concentrate the soul's attention on what is gloomy, as to create a region of darkness, in which the soul cannot see the benign features of God's character, or the mercy so brightly revealed in the Gospel. Thus, through a mental infirmity obscuring our views, our confidence fails; and our confidence failing, our evidence fails too. Such cases, however, are to be regarded as instances of mental disease, and not to be taken as a standard for others, whose minds are in a healthy state. Darkness of mind is originated, also, by sin, by negligence, by a spurious or defective experience, as well as by constitutional infirmity; and, indeed, the former are, we are persuaded, the most frequent causes of the absence of the Spirit's witness. The biography of good men shows that even where there is a constitutional tendency to mental depression, still, sound conversion and Christian fidelity have ordinarily been accompanied with a sense of God's favour. The devoted Brainerd had a natural tendency to depression, and sunk sometimes into depths of melancholy; but, observes his biographer, 'at these times he was not exercised about the state of his soul, with regard to the favour of God, and his interest in Christ, but about his own sinful infirmities and unfitness for God's service.' The pious Dr Payson had a natural tendency to depression; but, says his biographer, 'his melancholy never, in a single instance that is recollected, brought him into bondage, through fear of death. He invariably contemplated an exchange of worlds with complacency, as a desirable event, as a consummation devoutly to be wished.' Whatever exceptions, therefore, may be admitted in exacerbated cases of mental disease, it may be broadly stated as a Scriptural truth, that it is the privilege of God's people to know that they are pardoned, by the Spirit given unto them; and that by those who habitually walk with God, this witness will be enjoyed.

We have now to examine the witness of our own spirit. This is simply the testimony of our own judgment, or the answer of a good conscience. In the Holy Scriptures, the

features of God's children are clearly and faithfully delineated; and, by examining our state, and comparing it with the portrait therein described, we may judge whether or not the characteristics correspond with our state, and so conclude whether we are the sons of God.

1. Repentance and faith are required as essential to salvation, and their usual characteristics are portrayed. We examine our hearts to determine whether we have realized such a repentance and faith in Christ, and if we have, we rationally judge that we are God's children. The Apostle John says, 'We love him, because he first loved us.' If my experience attests that I love God, my judgment decides that God loves me. Indeed, true and sincere love to God necessarily presupposes a sense of God's pardoning love, for this is the origin, the exciting cause of my love to God. The same Apostle makes love to the brethren another test of the Christian character; and the Saviour himself places love to the brethren next in importance to our love to God. If, therefore, I imagine I love God, yet if I hate my fellow-men, my spirit witnesses against me that my religion is vain. But if my love to God generates pure benevolence to man, and fervent love to the brethren, my judgment or my spirit testifies that I am born of God. External obedience is also a test of sincere piety. 'If ye love me,' says the Saviour, 'keep my commandments.' Thus, if my supposed love to God and man be unaccompanied by obedience, it is an evidence that my love is spurious. On the other hand, if I find obedience to God my element and delight; if his statutes are my song in this the house of my pilgrimage, my understanding rationally infers that I am a true Christian. For inspired authority has said, 'He that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him.' All the fruits of the Spirit are so many evidences of a state of regeneration. 'Now the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.' Since the Saviour tells me that 'a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit,' it will follow that if in my spirit and temper I habitually exemplify these graces, my judgment determines that I am a spiritually-minded man, that I am led by the Spirit of God, and therefore am a 'son of God.' In the same manner we may infer our state from other

characteristics drawn by the pencil of truth. 'And hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him. For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God.'—1 John iii. 19—21.

2. We have here the witness of our own spirit; and in the case of the sincere Christian, this witness and that of the Holy Ghost will concur. The one is the echo of the other, responding to the same blessed testimony. The one is the reflection of the other, answering as face answers to face in a glass. What the Holy Ghost makes evident to our consciousness, the other makes evident to our reason. What the former reveals by an immediate impression, the latter demonstrates by inference and argument; and both unite in declaring that 'now are we the sons of God.'

3. It has been asked, What utility is there in two witnesses? With equal propriety it might be asked, Why has God given to man the faculty of consciousness as well as reason? Why has God given to man more means than one of ascertaining any truth with which his mind is conversant? Why has God made religion to consist in emotions of the heart, as well as intellectual perceptions of the understanding? Since the mind is constituted as it is, and religion consists of such elements as it does, we know not how the evidence of our acceptance could be complete on any other principle than that which embraces the two witnesses. If religion consisted only of intellectual perceptions and external actions, then the evidence of induction might suffice; but as religion consists of emotions as well as perceptions and actions, it is requisite that one branch of its evidence should be found in emotion. As religion addresses itself to our whole nature—intellectual, moral, and sentient—it is requisite that the testimony of its existence should pervade all our powers. In investigating the phenomena of mind, no man supposes that consciousness supersedes reason, or that reason supersedes consciousness; nor does any man complain that some truths in Nature are recognized by both faculties. Why, then, should it be a matter of complaint that it is so ordered in religion, especially in reference to the most important subject connected with religion—the knowledge of our

acceptance with God? The testimony of our reason is our own witness; but the testimony in our consciousness is the witness of God; if, therefore, we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater.

4. But in our being favoured with a twofold testimony, there is evidently great practical utility, as it is a protection against presumption on the one hand, and despondency on the other. Our Maker has placed a double guard around our spiritual and eternal interests. As he has provided, that where one bodily sense mistakes an object, another sense may correct it: so in reference to the important subject of saving religion, its evidence is placed both in our consciousness of the Spirit's witness, and the conviction of our own judgment. It is true the Holy Spirit can neither be deceived himself nor deceive others; his witness is true. It is true, also, that the sincere Christian is not ordinarily in danger of mistaking the witness of the Holy Ghost for a natural impulse or an enthusiastic emotion. But unconverted men are in danger, yea, in great danger, of mistaking some spurious impression for the testimony of the Holy Spirit. In such a case, the error may be corrected by reason and self-examination. For whatever impressions I may feel, if at the same time my conduct be habitually opposed to God's Word, my judgment and conscience must pronounce such impressions delusive. Hence the utility of our own spirit's witness to detect delusion and enthusiasm.

At the same time it is obvious that without the witness of the Holy Ghost, the witness of our own spirit would not be sufficient. The evidence would be incomplete. This is manifest from two reasons. First, the witness of God's Spirit, or a *sense* of pardon, is one very important item in the characteristics of God's children; and of this our spirit or judgment has to take cognizance in examining our state, and giving its verdict upon it. Now, if there be a total absence of a sense of pardon; if there be no comfortable persuasion in the soul that we are God's children, the evidence is at once defective in the chief characteristic of a true Christian. Hence the necessity of the Spirit's witness, to complete the chain of evidence on which our own spirit seeks to decide; and hence it is that the Scriptures never sanction the testimony of our own spirit alone, or irrespectively of the conjoint testimony of the Holy

Ghost. True, we are commanded to 'examine ourselves whether we be in the faith.' But the same passage says that 'Christ is in us, except we be reprobates;' so, then, Christ's being in the heart is essential to the Christian character, and is made a test of our own. Either he dwells in our heart, or he does not. If he does, this is known to us by his Spirit. But, by a carnal man, a spurious impression may be taken for the witness of that Spirit; therefore we are to examine ourselves whether we be in the faith. The object of examination is not to ascertain whether we have that which we are previously conscious we have not, but to test that which we have, or think we have, in order to decide whether it is proved to be genuine by corresponding fruits. It is clear, then, that the witness of God's Spirit is necessary to complete the evidence by which our own spirit or judgment must be enabled Scripturally to testify that we are the sons of God. If, therefore, a man's consciousness attests that he is totally and habitually destitute of a comfortable persuasion of God's favour, it is in vain for him to examine his state in quest of evidences of his adoption. The very first link in the chain of evidence is wanting. His own heart condemns him, and he should at once go to the throne of mercy, and seek the pardon of sin through a Saviour's death.

Secondly, the witness of our own spirit alone must be incomplete and inadequate, because it cannot give satisfaction to the mind. For it is no more than *inferential* testimony, and at best can never amount to more than a high degree of probability. True, the Holy Scriptures faithfully delineate the characters with which the promise of pardon is connected; but, in examining our own state, are we not in danger of mistaking our true character when the decision is left to be reasoned out? Would not that decision be greatly influenced by our capability of reasoning, which vastly differs among men? Would it not be greatly influenced by our natural temperament—the sanguine and hopeful being liable to draw conclusions too favourable, and the phlegmatic inclined to take too gloomy and desponding a view of their state? Again, should we not be in danger, from the influence of our inherent self-love, of hoping the best when we had reason to fear the worst? Facts in our own history show how much uncertainty must arise from these causes, and consequently what latitude would be given for

apprehension with thoughtful minds—the more thoughtful being the more liable to distressing apprehensions. Perfect satisfaction, therefore, could never be enjoyed from the mere testimony of our own spirit. Hence the necessity of another testimony direct from God himself, and that testimony addressed to a faculty, which, of all others, is the least liable to mistake or imposition—our *consciousness*. Thus an evidence is afforded which in itself inspires satisfaction and assurance, often filling the soul with consolation and joy.

Having given our views on this deeply interesting subject, it will not be unacceptable to the reader to know the sentiments of others. The venerable Wesley observes—'By the testimony of the Spirit, I mean an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God immediately and directly witnesses to my spirit, that I am a child of God, that 'Jesus hath loved me and given himself for me,' that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God.' In the Westminster Confession of Faith this important doctrine is maintained (chap. xii. page 83) :—'All those that are justified, God vouchsafeth, in and for his only Son Jesus Christ, to make partakers of the grace of adoption, by which they are taken into the number, and enjoy the liberties and privileges, of the children of God, have his name put upon them, receive the Spirit of adoption, have access to the throne of grace with boldness, and are enabled to cry, Abba, Father.' Dr Doddridge says that the Holy Spirit himself 'gives us an inward and joyful assurance that we are the children of God, and personally interested in his paternal love.' Mr S. Clarke has written in the defence of this witness of the Spirit, and describes it thus :—'When the Spirit of God, without our consideration of, or reflecting upon, any of those gracious qualifications he has formerly wrought in the soul, does, by his own immediate power, imprint this persuasion upon the heart—Thou art a child of God; and by an inward and secret, yet powerful voice, doth say to the soul—Thou art a believer, thy sins are pardoned, or to that purpose; and so satisfies the soul concerning its state and condition.' Dr Owen, in his 'Treatise on Communion with God,' page 293, saith, 'There are two ways whereby the Spirit worketh this joy in the heart of believers. 1. He doth it immediately by himself, without the consideration of any

other acts or works of his, or the interpositions of any reasonings, or deductions and conclusions. This does not arise from our reflex considerations of the love of God, but rather gives occasion thereunto. He so sheds abroad the love of God in our hearts, and fills them with gladness by an immediate act and operation. Of this joy there is no account to be given, but that the Spirit worketh it when and how He will. He secretly infuseth and distils it into the soul, prevailing against all fears and sorrows, filling it with gladness, exultation, and sometimes with unspeakable rapture of the mind.' To this the Doctor adds—'2. The Spirit works this joy also immediately, by his other works towards us, &c. These are after the common or ordinary manner.' Dr Goodwin, in vol. iv., part 2, pp. 95, 96, declares, 'That, besides the testimony of the water and the blood, that is, faith in the death of Christ and sanctification, there is a third testimony, and that is the Holy Ghost himself, which is immediate: that is, though it backs and confirms what the other two said, yet it quotes them not, builds not its testimony on them, but rouses the heart to see its adoption and sonship, by an immediate discovery of God's mind and love.' And a little after he adds—'This witness is not a testimony fetched out of a man's self, or the common work of the Spirit in man, as the others were, but he speaks from himself: As when the broad seal is put by a king, he writes *testa meipso*, so doth the Spirit speak in the language of a king, *testa meipso*, witness myself; and receives and borrows no witness from what is in us, but makes his own abundantly satisfy.'*

Dr A. Clarke, on Rom. viii. 15, has the following remarks:—

'The introduction of the words here shows that the persons in question had the strongest evidence of the excellence of the state in which they stood; they knew this by the Spirit of God which was given them on their adoption; and let me say, they could know it by no other means. The Father who had adopted them could be seen by no mortal eye; and the transition being purely of a spiritual nature, and transacted in heaven, can be known only by God's supernatural testimony of it upon earth. It is a matter of such solemn importance to

* Vide Dr Watts, vol. ii.

every Christian soul, that God in his mercy has been pleased not to leave it to *conjecture*, *assumption*, or *inductive reasoning*; but attests it by his own Spirit in the soul of the person whom he adopts through Christ Jesus. It is the grand and most observable case in which the intercourse is kept up between heaven and earth; and the genuine believer in Christ Jesus is not left to the *quibbles* or casuistry of polemic divines or critics, but receives the *thing* and the *testimony* of it immediately from God himself.'

While the witness of the Spirit is a solace to the believer amid the numerous trials of life, it invigorates and establishes all the virtues and graces of his character. Nehemiah says, 'The joy of the Lord is your strength.' It gives cheerfulness to duty, makes our feet run in the way of God's commandments, and constrains us to glory only in the cross of Christ. And while this witness inspires peace and joy, it engenders meekness and humility, promotes tenderness of conscience, and stimulates to higher attainments in holiness. The loving child of God aspires to be fully conformed to the image of his Lord. 'Happy the people in such a case: yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord.'

Here a question arises—How may the witness of the Holy Spirit be obtained? We reply, by the exercise of faith in the atoning blood of Christ. It is a blessing bestowed in connection with pardon. It is a new covenant privilege which God freely imparts to the soul of the believer. If any professor of religion be without it, let him not attempt to reason himself into a belief of his acceptance, but at once fly to the cross, and with a penitent heart rest on Christ alone for salvation: and let him thus rest on Christ habitually; and without doubt the Holy Spirit will enter his heart, and dispelling every fear, bear witness to his acceptance and adoption.

CHAPTER XII.

THE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION.

The word 'Regeneration' (παλιγγενεσία, a being born again) is used with considerable latitude of meaning. Amongst pro-

fane writers, it is frequently employed to express a renewal, or a change from an inferior to a better state of things. Greek writers apply it to the reproduction and transformation of Nature which take place in the time of spring. The Stoics use it when speaking of the world being *restored* to a better state. Clement, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, calls the *restoration* of the world after the deluge by the same name. Cicero, speaking of the state and dignity he had recovered when restored from exile, employs this term. Josephus uses this word in the same sense, when he tells us that the Jews, having returned from Babylon to Judea, kept a festival on account of the *restoration* of their own land. This word is employed by our Lord when speaking of the perfected Gospel dispensation, which being a new and better order of things, is fitly called 'the regeneration' (ἡ παλιγγενεσία).—Matt. xix. 28. By St Paul, the word is used in a *moral* sense, to express the renovation of the heart by the Holy Spirit: 'According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.' From the examples already given, it will be seen that the word is strikingly expressive of that great and glorious change which is experienced by every true believer in Christ.

Although several other terms are employed in Scripture to denote this change, they are all such as express substantially the same idea, and characterize the renovation of the believer as a real, spiritual work. Hence he is said to be 'born of God;' 'to be born of the Spirit;' 'to be born from above.' This gracious change is further described as a 'new creation,' and a 'resurrection from the dead.' These and similar forms of speech denote the reality and depth of the change experienced by the Christian believer; and show that it is not merely a reformation of manners, or an external conformity to some prescribed ceremonies and rules of conduct. Nicodemus appears to have been blameless in his moral conduct, and a sincere inquirer after truth; yet our Lord's teaching plainly implied that unless he were Divinely renewed, he could never enter into the kingdom of heaven. The rich man who reverently came to our Lord, presenting his solemn inquiry respecting the way to eternal life, was strictly moral in his conduct; yet our Lord's teaching showed him he was totally unfit for heaven, and could

never enter there without a change of heart. Regeneration is always described as an inward work, taking effect in the 'soul' and the 'heart'—renovating the will and the affections—purifying the very springs and motives of moral action. Seneca could teach that 'a man's actions could not be righteous unless his affections were righteous, because his conduct proceeded from his dispositions; and again, that a man's affections could not be righteous unless the habit of his soul was righteous, for from this source his affections flowed.'* This is a true sentiment, and one which (proceeding from a heathen) might well shame some modern philosophers who deny the distinction between good and evil, and might cause to blush some modern theologians, too, who make religion consist in external morality. But though Seneca could see that the nature of an action took its complexion from the state of the heart, he could not discover that the heart itself must be renewed by the Holy Spirit. The new birth—the process of regeneration by the Spirit—is a discovery of revelation alone, and the means of its accomplishment are provided only in the economy of Gospel salvation.

While regeneration is to be distinguished from mere reformation, it is to be distinguished also from justification. Although these two blessings always exist together in the heart, and the one cannot be severed from the other, yet they are quite distinct in their own nature. Justification is a change in our *relation* to God; regeneration is a change in our personal *state*, our affections, and character. Justification is the removal of the *guilt* we had contracted; regeneration is the subjugation of our natural depravity by the agency of the Holy Spirit. Justification removes the *penalty* the law denounces; regeneration implants a principle of obedience to the precepts the law enjoins. Justification is the introduction of the soul to God's favour; regeneration is a restoration of the soul to his *image*.

Dr Dwight, defining regeneration, says, 'This change of heart consists in a relish for spiritual objects, communicated to it by the power of the Holy Ghost.'† This definition is very defective, and calculated to mislead. A *penitent* has a relish for spiritual objects; he hungers and thirsts after righteousness; but a penitent is not regenerated. A man is not properly re-

* Seneca, Ep. 95. † Dwight's Theology, Sermon lxxiv.

generated until the blessings of salvation are not merely relished, but obtained and enjoyed. Regeneration does not precede, but accompanies justification. The moment a man receives the pardoning love of God is the moment he loves God; and the moment he loves God he is regenerated: for 'every one that loveth is born of God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God.' Dr Watts, with more propriety than Dwight, says:—'They who have been thus changed and renewed by the blessed Spirit of God, have a new and spiritual principle and temper given to them, and are made holy. As by being born of man we become the children of Adam, and gain a sinful nature, so by being born of God we become the sons of God, and gain a Divine, a holy nature. We are born of God unto holiness, as we are born of flesh unto sin.'* This definition is sound and Scriptural; and the following, from the revered Fletcher, closely resembles it:—'In general we may say it (regeneration) is that great change by which a man passes from a state of nature to a state of grace. He was an animal man; in being born again he becomes a spiritual man. His natural birth had made him like to fallen Adam, to the Old Man, against whom God had pronounced the sentence of death, seeing it is the wages of sin. But his spiritual birth makes him like to Jesus Christ, to the New Man, which is created according to God in righteousness and true holiness.'† But the clearest and the most expressive definition we have met with is furnished by the gifted R. Watson. He says:—'Regeneration is that mighty change in man, wrought by the Holy Spirit, by which the dominion which sin had over him in his natural state, and which he deplores and struggles against in his penitent state, is broken and abolished; so that, with full choice of will and the energy of right affections, he serves God freely, and runs in the way of his commandments. "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace. But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." Deliverance from the bondage of sin, and the power and the will to do all things which are pleasing to God,

* Watts's Works, vol. i. 59. † Fletcher's Works, vol. v. 281.

both as to inward habits and outward acts, are therefore the distinctive characters of this state.'*

Thus regeneration is not a change in the substance of the soul, but a change in its moral qualities and dispositions. As man by the fall lost none of his bodily members, so he lost none of his mental faculties. He has still an understanding, though it is darkened; he has still a conscience, though it is depraved; he has still a will, though it is averse to holiness; he has still affections, though they are alienated from God. Therefore, in regeneration there is not the creation of new faculties, but the infusion of new qualities. Light instead of darkness; holiness instead of sin; love to God instead of enmity against him; and this love becomes a principle of obedience, constraining the soul to run in the way of God's commandments.

While it is true that regeneration does not superadd any new mental faculty to the soul, yet it is equally true that every faculty of the soul partakes of the gracious renovation, and becomes appropriated to a holy and religious use. Hence, in this blessed change—

1. The understanding is enlightened. This faculty is the eye of the mind; but in the unregenerate it is in darkness. However acute in its perceptions and vigorous in its operations in reference to ordinary subjects, it is dull, inert, and beclouded in spiritual things. Men are 'alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their hearts.' But the regenerated man is turned from darkness unto God's marvellous light. Being rational and moral agents, the understanding is the faculty on which the Holy Spirit first operates. As light was the element which God first formed from the chaotic mass, and was the beginning of those wondrous transformations which were effected by the omnipotent Jehovah, so it is in the spiritual world. 'God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' This light is unique in its kind. It is not the light of science which discovers the phenomena of Nature; it is not the light of mental philosophy, so called, which analyzes the powers and operations of the

* Watson's Works, vol. xi. 249.

mind: it is the light of *Divine truth*, communicated by the Holy Spirit. It reveals those things which the light of science cannot reach, and makes the souls of even the simple and illiterate acquainted with those subjects which the most vigorous and highly-cultivated intellects never discovered, and are often the slowest to learn. It shines into the putrid dungeon of the sinner's heart, and discovers its loathsomeness and abominations. It reveals the purity and spirituality of the Divine law, its extensive requirements and powerful obligations. It exposes the ingratitude, the baseness, and malignity of the sinner's conduct, and expels his delusive visions of self-righteousness. It discloses the vanity, folly, and emptiness of the world, and places them in affecting contrast with the infinite value of the soul, and the solemn importance of eternal realities. It unfolds the nature, design, and efficacy of the atoning sacrifice, and its wonderful adaptation to the necessities of man and the glory of God. It shows us God himself; God reconciled; God in his paternal as well as in his magisterial character—God as our loving Father, our faithful and unchangeable Friend. This is, indeed, marvellous light—marvellous in itself and in the discoveries it makes. The scenes of beauty and grandeur which burst at once upon the sight of the man who had been born blind, do not surpass these new wonders in the moral world which are revealed to the view of him who is born of the Spirit. There is no aspect in this great change on which the apostles dilate more copiously than our transition from darkness to light, and their language identifies its spiritual origin as well as its marvellous results; for it introduces all its partakers into new regions of truth and blessedness. The educated Roman, the philosophic Greek, and the privileged Jew, as well as the ignorant barbarian, receive in regeneration a degree of illumination which contrasts with their former state as one of ignorance, darkness, and folly, and gives such a new colouring to every object they contemplate, that they seem suddenly to have passed into a new world, and commenced a new era of existence. A new era, indeed, it is, and a new world too, except that their locality is unchanged: 'the darkness is past, and the true light shineth.'

2. In regeneration the conscience is rectified, and made to assume its proper office. Conscience is the faculty which

takes cognizance of the moral character of our thoughts, sentiments, and actions, and passes judgment upon them—approving or condemning them according to the view which the mind takes of their nature. In the unregenerate, this faculty performs its office but partially and unfaithfully. It is neither correct in its decisions, nor faithful in its admonitions. The understanding being darkened, the conscience cannot properly exercise its functions. Its testimony, like that of an ignorant and suborned witness, is not to be relied upon. Saul of Tarsus, in the days of his ignorance, thought he was doing God service when shedding the blood of saints; and often the habit of sinning so effectually perverts the decisions, and stultifies the feelings of conscience, that men call evil good, and good evil. Now, in regeneration, the conscience is quickened, purged, and rectified. When Divine light shines into the understanding, the conscience is stimulated and aroused, and the sinner, convicted and condemned, cries out, 'What must I do to be saved?' When the penitent exercises faith in the atoning blood, the alarmed conscience is tranquillized, for it is purged from dead works. Though there is then the most vivid perception of the evil of sin, yet there is no sense of guilt, no feeling of condemnation.

The conscience, being enlightened and purified, assumes its proper office. It becomes a transcript of the Divine law—a tablet on which our duty is clearly registered. Instructed and directed by the Word and the Holy Spirit, it becomes the vicegerent of God in the human soul, dictating his will and enforcing his high authority. It is made quick and tender, and susceptible of Divine impressions; delicately sensitive of the very approach of evil, and prompt and faithful in its intimations of whatever is pleasing to God. Then is fulfilled the gracious promise, 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.'—Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27.

3. In regeneration the will is renewed. Man's will, in its

natural state, is repugnant to God. The carnal mind is enmity against him, and therefore rebels against his authority. In a state of penitence the will is subdued and broken down into submission, but in regeneration it acquires a bias and leaning towards God. As iron when magnetized acquires a new property, and steadily turns to the pole, so the will, impregnated by a Divine principle, receives a new direction: its original tendencies are counteracted, and it habitually points towards God. Penitence changed its resistance into submission, and pardoning love changed submission into approval and loyal obedience.

4. In regeneration, the affections and passions are renovated. Before, they were directed by instinct, or controlled by selfishness and sin; now, they are directed and governed by the Holy Spirit. They are now reversed. The Christian loves the things he once hated, and hates the things he once loved. Once he loved sin, now he abhors it. But he loves God supremely. In his depraved state his affections were alienated from his Maker; now they are centered in him. In classifying the fruits of the Spirit, St Paul gives to love the first place in the category—'The fruit of the Spirit is love'—the first fruit in the soil of a regenerate heart. 'We love him because he first loved us'—'the love of Christ constraineth us.' The renovated soul beholds God as a being infinitely amiable and glorious, and therefore worthy the supreme affection and adoration of all his intelligent creatures. He regards himself as under immeasurable obligations, and therefore with supreme satisfaction and delight he cleaves to him as his chief good; and, spurning the pretensions of every rival, exclaims, 'Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth I desire besides thee.' His love to God generates sincere and ardent love to his people. 'We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.' 'He that loveth not his brother abideth in death.' His love extends to all men. His social affections, purified, controlled, and ennobled by the superior principle of love to God, reach to the whole family of man. He loves God's law, for it is the visible expression of his holy will; and, instead of complaining that his commandments are grievous, he binds them to his heart, saying, 'O Lord, how I love thy law.' He *fears* God,

yet not as a slave fears a tyrant, but as an obedient child fears a loving parent. His fear is one which consorts with confidence and love; it is a holy, filial reverence, as far from tormenting apprehension as from indifference and presumption. He has *joy* in God—derives his happiness from him. He has left his broken cisterns, forsaken his shallow, turbid streams of carnal and unholy pleasure, and draws his happiness from the living, inexhaustible, and eternal fountain—'The Lord is my portion, saith my soul.' His *ambition* is changed. In his depraved state he boasted of his sins—gloried in his shame; but, being renewed, he glories only in the Lord. The principle of ambition is not destroyed, but totally changed in its object. In regeneration the nature and object of our *hopes* are changed. The natural man's hopes are earthly, excited by mere sensual desires, and confined to terrestrial possessions and enjoyments. Such a one cannot be said to hope for heaven, as neither that place nor state is an object of his desire. He prefers the interests of the body to those of the soul, and the pleasures of time to the joys of eternity. If adversity or approaching death throws his contemplations upon the future world, his hopes of final safety are only fallacious and destructive. But the hopes of the regenerate man are transferred along with his affections to heaven. They are spiritual in their nature, and secure in their foundation. The future glories of the unseen world inflame his desires, and inspire the most animating expectations. 'He is begotten again to a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away.' The regenerated man 'walks by *faith*, not by sight.' He believes God's threatenings, and averts them by fleeing from sin; he believes God's promises, and embraces them. His soul is influenced by the invisible realities of another life. As the orb of his mental vision is not bounded by the narrow horizon of this earthly sphere, so his emotions are not limited to sensible and present objects. Eternity lies unveiled before him, and its solemnities give a spiritual complexion to his thoughts and emotions.

Without specifying every faculty and affection of our mental constitution, we remark, in brief, that the great work of regeneration so far renovates the whole as to give them a

new character, and direct them to new objects. Although it neither creates nor annihilates a single mental faculty, it places all our powers under a new influence, the influence of the Holy Ghost; and his agency gives them a new direction and appropriation—alienating them from sin, and consecrating them to God.

This *inward* change of the *heart* becomes manifest by a corresponding change in the *life*. It is made visible by our *external* conduct. 'By their fruits ye shall know them. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.'

1. If a man is regenerated, he will manifest it by overcoming the world. 'For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.'—1 John v. 4. The soul born again resists the blandishments and disregards the frowns of the world. He is in the world, but not of it; he uses the world, but does not abuse it. The spirit, views, and purposes which actuate him are as opposed to those of the worldling as noon is to midnight; and he can neither seek his company nor conform to his practices. For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or, what part hath he that believeth with him that is an infidel? There is here a spirit of perfect antagonism, and that antagonism on the part of the regenerate is victorious—it overcometh the world.

2. Another evidence of regeneration is 'dominion over sin.' He that committeth sin is of the devil. But 'whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin: for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil.' This passage does not teach the *absolute* impossibility of man's falling into sin after being regenerated; for this would imply that his probation terminated with conversion—a notion which is not only contradicted by the whole tenor of Scripture, but is disproved by mournful instances of true believers falling into sin. Mr Wesley interprets the passage as signifying that, while a man is in a regenerate state, it is impossible for him to fall into actual voluntary transgression,

because his mind must have broken away from Christ before he actually yields to temptation. This distinction betwixt mental defection and actual transgression is a refinement which seems scarcely compatible with the plain and simple teaching of the Apostle John. Besides, the act of the mind in departing from Christ is itself a sinful act; and if the individual was in a regenerate state up to the very moment of his mental departure from Christ, it follows that it is possible for a regenerate man to fall into sin; and, such being the case, the language of the Apostle is not to be understood *absolutely*. St John is speaking of the general marks which characterize the people of God and distinguish them from the wicked. It is the characteristic of the one that they live in sin; it is their habit to work iniquity. It is the characteristic of the other to flee from sin; holiness is their habit and their element. When he says that such cannot sin, he means that sin is repugnant to their spiritual nature and sanctified affections. As we usually say of a person of known integrity, 'He cannot lie, he cannot cheat, and commit other enormities, for such conduct is contrary to his principles and character'—so the Apostle says respecting the regenerate, 'He cannot sin, because he is born of God.' There is that light in his mind that shows him the evil and malignity of sin; there is that bias in his heart that disposes him to loathe and hate sin; there is that spiritual seminal principle or disposition which breaks the force and power of sin; there is that love to God which makes him delight to do his will, so that it is contrary to the nature of his new-born soul to commit sin; and, when temptation is presented, instead of yielding to the suggestions of the enemy, as the ungodly habitually do, he repels the tempter, exclaiming, 'How *can* I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?'

We are aware that some theologians hold views on this subject much lower than these here advocated, and, like Augustine, found their views upon the state described by St Paul, in Rom. vii.—supposing that the Apostle is there delineating his own state of mind at the time he wrote. But such a notion is derogatory to the Apostle's character, and contrary to the scope of his argument, as well as opposed to the whole strain of Scriptural teaching. It is true St Paul, in that chapter, is speaking in the first person; but it is clear

that the description applies to a carnal, not to a regenerated state. Admitting that he was referring to his own experience (a supposition which the Apostle's discourse does not necessarily imply), he is setting forth a state of mind experienced prior to his union with Christ; a state of mind which he designates 'carnal,' 'sold under sin'—a state of bondage and captivity, in which the soul vainly struggles for victory or deliverance, and in desperation and anguish cries out, 'Oh, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' To suppose that such was the state of the Apostle himself at the time he wrote—the state of one whose attainments and enjoyments were never surpassed, perhaps never equalled—is monstrous; yet, on the principle of applying it to a regenerated state at all, it must refer to the Apostle's personal state, as he speaks in the first person. Nor does it obviate the difficulty to suppose that the Apostle, in the spirit of deep humility, has exaggerated his state of sinful bondage and mental distress beyond the facts of the case; for this is a foolish attempt to rescue his character as a Christian at the expense of his authority as an inspired writer. We are therefore compelled to reject the notion of Augustine and his followers, who maintain that St Paul was describing his own state at the time he wrote that epistle; and if the description does not apply to himself at that period, it cannot be even pretended to have reference to regenerate characters in general.*

The description is that of an awakened sinner, as the whole drift of the argument proves; such a one who has light to see the purity and spirituality of the law, and the depravity of his heart; while the ineffectual struggles of his soul against the

* Even Augustine himself, when not in the heat of controversy with Pelagius, acknowledged that in the seventh chapter of Romans the Apostle was personating an unregenerate man, and says, '*Homo sub lege positus, ante gratiam*;' a man under the power of the law, before he receives the Divine favour. Most of the ancient Greek commentators, and some moderate Calvinists, take the same view. Dr Macknight justly observes, 'They who think the Apostle is here describing his own case, and the case of other regenerated persons, should consider that he does not speak of single instances of omission of duty and commission of sin; for the words which he uses, κατεργάζομαι, πράσσω, ποιῶ, all denote a *continuation* or *habit of acting*. Now, how such a habit of doing evil and neglecting good can be attributed to any regenerated person, and especially to the Apostle Paul, who, before this epistle was written, told the Thessalonians, '*Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily, and righteously, and unblameably we behaved among you*,' I confess I do not comprehend.'—Com., vol. i. 286.

corruptions of his nature, show him his helpless and wretched condition. It is the state of one who has not yet found the deliverance of the sons of God, who has not yet experienced the efficacy of the Redeemer's blood—who is not in Christ, but under the law. Hence, in the verses following, the Apostle brings this distressed and agonizing soul to Christ, and the moment he does this, a new scene opens to our view. The man becomes a new creature; the sighs of bondage are exchanged for notes of freedom, the language of overwhelming anguish for expressions of grateful joy, and the impotent struggles of the helpless victim for an energy that triumphs over sin. He who before cried out, 'Oh, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' now exultingly exclaims, 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.' Thus the Apostle's argument, when carried to its issue, just establishes the truth we contend for—namely, that dominion over sin is one essential characteristic of regeneration; and this he teaches in the plainest manner in all his writings. 'Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Christ, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin.'—Rom. vi. 6, 7. He that is truly regenerated, and who walks by faith in Christ, is no longer under the enslaving domination of sin, even as the risen and glorified body of the Saviour is no longer under the dominion of death and the grave—'knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' 'Sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.'—Rom. vi. 9—11, 14. In reference to sin, as well as in

reference to death, the believer may sing, 'Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.'

3. This great change is further evidenced by an entire change in the nature of his pursuits. Spiritual and devotional exercises engage his attention with seasonable frequency. He delights in reading the book of God, and in pondering its sacred truths, its holy precepts, its consoling promises, and instructive narratives. He goes to the Bible, as the priest of old repaired to the holy oracle, to commune with God, and hear what the Lord will say unto his servant; and while the heavenly word distils in his heart, he says, 'O Lord, how I love thy law.' 'How sweet are thy words unto my taste, yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth. Through thy precepts I get understanding: therefore I hate every false way.' He loves the duties of the closet, and daily holds communion with God in retirement. He erects an altar in his family, and, like Abraham, teaches his household to observe the way of the Lord. The ordinances of God's house are sources of instruction and holy pleasure; the communion of saints is esteemed a precious privilege. He does not, like some, despise the means of grace, nor forget to assemble with the people of God, but, with David, exclaims, 'I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord.' 'How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts! My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord: my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God.' 'For a day in thy courts is better than a thousand. I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.' He manifests a deep and absorbing interest in the welfare of the Church of God. He prefers Jerusalem above his chief joy, and could sooner allow his right hand to forget its cunning than he could forget her imperative claims upon his affections, prayers, and benevolent labours. While he loves the Church, he pities the world that lieth in wickedness, and sighs and toils for the conversion of man; reckoning himself a debtor to all men, he is ready to promote their interests in every possible way. He does evil to none, but, as he has opportunity, he strives to do good to all men, especially to them that are of the household of faith.

4. This change shines forth in *all* his conversation. In-

tegrity and pure benevolence mark all his deportment towards man, and sincerity and devoted piety his conduct in reference to God. He denies himself that he may have wherewith to benefit others. All his lawful enjoyments and innocent recreations are tempered by moderation and self-government; keeping every sense under proper restraint, never permitting the animal part of his nature to subjugate and enslave the rational. His passions are controlled by reason, and reason itself is enlightened and guided by the word and Spirit of God. He avoids every known sin, he shuns the very appearance of evil, he fulfils every known duty, and he glorifies God in his body and in his spirit, which are God's. Nor is this obedience irksome or painful. Regenerating grace has fixed a principle within which prompts and constrains to these duties, and renders them his element and delight. There is such a clear conviction of the rectitude of God's claims and the excellency of his will, that the man's judgment coincides with all God's requirements. There is such a sense of the malignity of sin, that it is abhorred as the greatest evil in existence. There is such an inherent approval and love of holiness, as makes the soul habitually cleave to it; and there is such a view of the immensity of his own obligations to God for his unbounded love, as inspires the most intense gratitude, and prompts the eager inquiry, 'How shall I please the Lord?' 'In what way can I most promote his glory, and give expression to the love I owe to his blessed name?' 'What shall I render to the Lord for all his benefits?'

5. Great and important as is the change which regeneration accomplishes, entering into the very depths of our moral constitution, changing the very foundations of thought and moral action, inspiring new motives and springs of action, it does not obliterate that diversity of natural temperament and of mental characteristic which distinguishes man from man. However great the spiritual change, *this* variety is preserved, giving a distinct complexion to the features and aspect which every Christian character presents, and perpetuating an individuality and originality in each child of God. The phlegmatic never becomes of a sanguine temperament, nor the sanguine of a phlegmatic temperament. Conversion never changes a Saul of Tarsus into a John, nor a John into a Simon Peter, nor a

Melancthon into a Luther. Amidst an essential *moral* resemblance, there is still a constitutional variety—a variety which unfolds the higher qualities of sanctified human nature, presents the greater array of moral beauty in the Church of God, fits every man for a peculiar sphere of exertion, and qualifies believers in their collective capacity for more diversified action, and more abundant usefulness. Saul of Tarsus, in regeneration, lost no portion of his vivacity, his ambition, his energy of character; but grace took hold of these qualities, and sanctified them for God. Thus, his active masculine intellect darted into the mysteries of the Gospel far beyond that of his compeers; his ambition became transferred from the laurels of human learning to the glories of the cross; and his decision and energy carried him 'forth to the regions beyond,' and urged him to abundant and unceasing labours in the cause of Christ: the ardour of the sanguinary persecutor was employed in the holy enterprise of the Apostle. The indomitable courage and inflexible energy which Cranfield displayed in his carnal state, as a soldier at Gibraltar, he ever afterwards exemplified as a soldier of the cross, conflicting with ignorance and depravity as ardently as ever he had done when he fearlessly stood at the cannon's mouth. Had Napoleon been converted in early life, he could not have remained a private Christian. His intrepidity and energy, joined with his high intellectual qualities, fitted him to be a distinguished agent in shaking the papal throne, regenerating the Church, and saving as many by the Gospel as he despatched by the murderous sword. The grace of God is magnified in its power to appropriate the diversified properties of human nature to a heavenly use. It extracts the poisonous *virus* from our hearts, and infuses a Divine power, which neither destroys nor paralyzes our natural faculties, but devotes them, like the vessels of the temple, to the service and honour of Him who made them. Grace is a Divine alchemy which transmutes all into the fine gold of the sanctuary.

6. This gracious change takes place subsequently to justification. This has been incidentally stated already, but its importance demands a separate consideration. It is not meant, however, that any perceptible period of time elapses between our acceptance and regeneration: we speak more in reference

to distinction in *order* than in *time*. Perhaps it would be more proper to speak of regeneration as a concomitant of justification, for the moment of our pardon is certainly the moment of our being born again. When we believe in Christ with the heart unto righteousness we are justified; the pardoning love of God is shed abroad in our heart: and then, becoming possessed of a new principle, we are born again. Intimately connected as these blessings are, it is important to distinguish them from each other; and conjoined as they are in their bestowment, yet their order cannot be transposed. It cannot be said that regeneration precedes justification, for that would confound repentance with regeneration as one and the same state of mind, which is unscriptural. It would involve the absurdity and presumption of supposing that we love God before he loves us. St John asserts that God's love to us is the exciting cause of our love to him. We love him because he first loved us; but the other notion contradicts the Apostle, and reverses the order of things, maintaining that God loves us because we FIRST loved him. St Paul says that the love of Christ constraineth us, but that notion teaches that our love constrains Christ. Again, St Paul maintains, as a cardinal doctrine, that God 'justifieth the ungodly,' but that notion teaches the reverse—that God justifies the godly, and will not justify a man until he is godly; that instead of justifying a man as a sinner, he justifies him as a saint; that instead of receiving man, through Christ, in order to cleanse and purify him, he first cleanses him and then receives him; that he restores him to his image ere he receives him into his favour. Such a notion reverses and overturns the Gospel plan of salvation. It was a notion akin to this—it was such an obscure, confused, and unscriptural view of the plan of salvation—which introduced the doctrine of human merit, and for ages hid the pure light of the Gospel from mankind. It is this, too, which hinders multitudes from immediate salvation, which makes men delay until some future, undefined, and undefinable period their salvation, although God calls and commands them to come now —'Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.' It is this notion which originates endless doubts in the minds of men, when they might walk in sunshine; which generates a legal spirit, and detracts from the glory of the

Saviour, and the free mercy and grace of God to mankind. This notion subserves the purposes of Satan, and accords with the natural pride of the human heart, and for this reason he will strive to perpetuate and extend its influence to the utmost of his power; but those who are set for the defence and propagation of the Gospel should zealously labour to extirpate it from the earth. The doctrine of free grace not only bids a sinner welcome to pardon, but offers it this moment. He need not wait another instant. Let him now resolve to give up all his sins; let him now throw away every idol, and by faith surrender himself to Christ, as to an all-sufficient Saviour, and he is God's child, and regeneration will as certainly follow as light succeeds the rising sun.

7. From these remarks it will be seen that we hold the doctrine of instantaneous regeneration. There is undoubtedly a preparatory process, in the acts of consideration, repentance, and faith; and that preparatory process will be short or protracted, according to the conduct of the sinner—accordingly as he yields to the calls and influences of the Spirit, or resists them! Some, alas! maintain for years a painful conflict between nature and grace, while others submit at once, and are saved. Thus Lydia yielded, and was saved. Thus the trembling gaoler inquired the way of salvation, and submitting, was at once made happy in God, and the fruits of his regeneration were immediately manifest. He rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house. It therefore behoves us to urge sinful men to an instant compliance with God's requirements. All things are now ready, and the moment the penitent believes for himself in the great atonement, he is accepted through Christ, and *then* he is born of God—the dead is alive again, the lost is found.

8. This great change is necessary. Numerous passages declare this truth. Our Lord's solemn asseveration should fall with power upon our hearts—'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born from *above* (ἄνωθεν) he cannot see the kingdom of God.' Nicodemus was little prepared to hear this declaration. He was a son of Abraham, a teacher in Israel, very probably a moral man, a believer in Christ as the Messiah, walking according to the light he had, and inquiring for more; yet our Lord insists upon the absolute necessity of his being

renewed, or born from above. Many, in like manner, are startled at this doctrine, and marvel when they hear it proclaimed; but the change is required alike from all men.

(*a*) Without this great change there can be no true virtue or obedience. No obedience can be real unless it spring from a right principle; but there can be no right principle apart from love to God; and as the love of God in our hearts constitutes the essential element in regeneration, we see how absolutely necessary it is that the soul should be regenerated in order to walk with God in holy obedience. There may, it is true, be the virtue of the heathen without regeneration; but heathen virtue and Gospel obedience are distinct, often opposite things. There may be the virtue of the Pharisee without regeneration; but the seeming virtue of the Pharisee springs from morbid and unholy affections—from pride, ostentation, and hypocrisy—and, as such, it is denounced by the Saviour with awful expressions of Divine displeasure. And as an admonition to all who look for no higher qualities, he has caused it to be recorded, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven.'

(*b*) This great change is essential to our happiness in the present world. Without regeneration there may be sensual pleasure—the pleasure of the brute—the pleasure arising from the gratification of animal appetite and passion; but there can be no spiritual enjoyment. Harmony is essential to inward happiness, but there is no harmony in the soul of a degenerate man. There is a war in his bosom—a conflict between his conscience and affections, between the dictates of his judgment (especially when the truth has penetrated it) and the desires and passions of his unrenewed heart; and in company with this there is not unfrequently a dread of Divine vengeance, and fearful forebodings of that solemn futurity which awaits him. How can a man be happy with such awful discord in his heart—with elements of future torment already in his unsanctified bosom? God has ordained as a part of our constitution that there can be no happiness without holiness. And it is well. The absence of happiness is a constant monition to the sinner that he is wrong. As the pain of a burn is designed as a merciful admonition to avoid contact with fire, so the absence

of happiness—of that which man is instinctively prompted to seek—is the voice of God inviting the sinner to himself; while the connection of happiness with holiness operates as a preservative to obedience. It is an appeal to a powerful instinct, presenting a motive to continue in the service and love of God.

Now, regeneration produces this harmony. While it enlightens the mind, it purifies the affections, and gives them a spiritual bias and direction. While it quickens the conscience, it tranquillizes it; while it shows the evil of sin, it breaks its dominion, and gives power to resist it; while it shows the path of duty, it supplies a new principle of obedience, an energy from heaven. That which the enlightened conscience dictates, the will approves, the affections admire and love; and the tranquillity effected between the faculties of our mental and moral constitution, is accompanied with a sense of the Divine favour, not only inspiring peace, but sometimes joy unspeakable and full of glory. Such are the elements of true, solid enjoyment—enjoyment refined as our spiritual nature, vast as our capacities, and lasting as the soul's duration. To realize this happiness regeneration is, as we have seen, essentially necessary.

(*c*) This great change is essential to our future and eternal happiness. Christ has declared that, without it, we cannot see the kingdom of God. From this there is no appeal. Heaven is the perfection of holiness, as it is of happiness; and if these are essentially connected in earth, they must be inseparable in heaven. If an unregenerate mind cannot be happy on earth, how can it in heaven? If such a soul could be admitted there, it could realize no enjoyment, because it could feel no sympathy with the objects and pursuits of that world. All things would be alien to it, and it would be alien to them. It would be like a heaven of grandeur to the blind, like a heaven of music to the deaf, and like a heaven of philosophy to a man destitute of all mental comprehension. But there would be not only the absence of sympathy and relish for heaven, but positive repugnance and hostility. The carnal mind is enmity against God, and that enmity would operate in heaven as well as upon earth; and operate, too, with an intensity exceeding that now felt, in the ratio of the soul's increased capability to think and to feel. And who can estimate this, and

the consequent misery it must excite? If the sinner is now averse to the presence of God, the communion of his Spirit, the restraints of his government, and the requirements of his law, how much must that aversion be increased when he is introduced within the precincts of God's presence, and the beams of his glory!—a sensual, earthly, malignant being, in a region of perfect purity and spirituality, where every bright intelligence is influenced by the holiest affections, where the Supreme Being receives the most loyal homage, and the ages of eternity are measured by the anthems which proclaim his praise! Under such circumstances the depraved and unwelcome spirit would feel a hell of conflicting and tormenting passions, and seek a refuge from that refulgent glory and holiness by which its presence would be stricken and confounded.

But the sinner need not speculate upon the possibility of admission to heaven. It cannot be. Resistance to the regenerating Spirit, and to the saving grace of God, will close the gates of heaven against him. Its pure atmosphere is never to be tainted by the poisonous breath of the sinner; its holy society is never to be annoyed by the presence of a rebel against God. If angels were banished when they rebelled once, shall man, who a thousand times resists the invitations of mercy, be admitted there? No, never! Here society is mixed, because sin has polluted all. Here the leper may dwell for a season in company with his fellow-lepers, for all partake of the contagion; but in heaven all are holy, blood-washed, regenerated, sanctified, and nothing that defileth or maketh a lie can enter into the new Jerusalem. His unsanctified spirit must company with its kind. His depraved affections and malignant tempers fit him only for the society of devils and lost spirits like himself, and the elements of misery possessed in his own mind will of themselves constitute a hell sufficient to make him tremble to contemplate its horrors. To save the soul from everlasting woe, it is essential, therefore, that it be regenerated by the grace of God—'we must be born again.'

Having noticed the nature, the fruits, and necessity of the 'new birth,' it now remains for us to consider *how* it is accomplished. The Scriptures uniformly represent the Holy Spirit as the efficient cause. That glorious Being, who at first moved upon the chaotic mass, impregnating it with his influence, and

transforming it into order and beauty, is the agent in the sinner's renovation, beginning, carrying forward, and completing the work of grace. It is the Holy Spirit that convinces him of sin, of righteousness, and judgment.—John xvi. 8. When born again, it is of, or by, the Spirit.—John iii. 5. His renewing is 'of the Holy Ghost.'—Titus iii. 5. He is 'changed into this glory by the Spirit of the Lord.'—2 Cor. iii. 18. The change is spiritual, and the efficient agent producing it must be a Divine and Spiritual Being. 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh; but that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.'—John iii. 6. It is true that various subordinate agencies and instrumentalities are employed in this work. The ministry of the word, religious ordinances, and the dispensations of Providence are generally employed. But the agency of the sinner himself is essential as a co-worker with God in this important change. God neither forces the human will, nor saves man without his concurrence and co-operation. At the same time, if man were not favoured with the enlightening and renovating power of the Holy Ghost, all forms of instrumentality, and personal efforts, would be in vain; or, rather, no personal efforts would be made. God the Spirit imparts a measure of light, invites to salvation, and excites spiritual desires. Then, if his gracious influences are yielded to, he bestows them more abundantly—'gives grace for grace.' If still obeyed, he imparts further help; and on the penitent fully resigning himself to Christ by faith, takes up his abode in his heart, sheds his love abroad therein, and thus the soul is regenerated.

The restoration of the Holy Spirit to the heart of man, is the restoration of man to dignity, holiness, and happiness. The Bible states that when man was created, 'God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.' There is much implied in this statement. It means not only that God then tenanted the body with a spiritual, intelligent, and immortal inhabitant, but that God infused into man his own Spirit. As, when Christ 'breathed upon his disciples, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' so, when he breathed into man's nostrils the breath of *lives* (חיים) he gave to him the Holy Ghost, to dwell in him as his guide, comforter, strengthener, and the source of his holy affections and obedience. But when man yielded to the tempter, that Spirit,

grieved and insulted, departed from him; and man became depraved as well as guilty—bereft of his inward strength as well as of his innocence. Through our redemption by Christ, that blessed Agent is again given, first, to operate upon man's heart, and then (when man receives Christ by faith) to dwell in his heart as a permanent guest. Thus, man is regenerated—his body made a temple of the Holy Ghost, and his soul restored to the image of God.

The theology of *Formalism*, which has lately presented itself again under the patronage of Oxford literature, impugns both the spirituality of this great change, and the proper agency to which it is ascribed, assigning to the rite of baptism that efficacy which the Scriptures attribute to the Holy Spirit.

The views on baptismal regeneration entertained by Dr Pusey, the leader in the revival of this heresy, may be gathered from the following extract, in which he puts forth his strength against evangelical sentiment. He asks—'And yet is it no privilege that we have been saved' (by baptism), 'have been taken out of the state in which we by nature were, without any deserts of our own, before we knew, of ourselves, good or evil, but had the evil of our fallen nature adhering to us; that, not by any frail will, or purpose, or faith of our own, but by God's strong hand, we were plucked out of the depth of misery in which we lay, and out of the deep mire of sin; and "our feet set upon the rock," "in a large," free, disentangled "place," where our goings are ordered? Is it no cause of thankfulness to our Heavenly Father, to have to look back upon a definite ACT of God, whereby he "placed us in a state of salvation," there, by his grace, to continue; that independently of any feelings of ours, which may not be so vivid as they once were, antecedently to all of error, infirmity, and sin, which there may have been in our course hitherto, and the imperfections which have cleaved, and (it is to be feared) do cleave to all our acts, marring our repentances, our faith, our works of love, there is still one bright spot whereon to look back, when God the Father chose us to be his sons in his Son, and the Holy Ghost sanctified and sealed us as his? Is it nothing to bear His mark upon us, which his mercy has been more powerful to retain, we trust, than our sins to efface?'* Such are the senti-

* Dr Pusey on Baptism, Tract lxvii. p. 88.

nents advocated by this teacher of theology. Now, if baptism, n infancy, has a saving virtue so powerful, and so perpetual, hat the sins of manhood cannot efface it, great indeed must be ts efficacy; and secure indeed must their state be who have been so favoured as to be brought unconsciously to the bapismal font, and received the ablution of some priest in the line of apostolical succession. Can any dogma of Popery be more calculated to blind the understanding and stultify the conscience? The efficacy which this learned Doctor ascribes to baptism in infancy, he of course ascribes also to adult baptism. His sentiments on the subject generally, he expresses in the following quotation from Augustine:—'Most excellently,' saith he, writing against the Pelagians, 'do the Punic Christians entitle baptism itself no other than SALVATION, and the sacrament of the body of Christ no other than LIFE. Whence, except in an old, as I deem, an apostolic, tradition, by which they hold it to be implanted into the Church of Christ, that without baptism, and the participation of the Lord's table, no man can arrive either at the kingdom of God or salvation and life eternal?'* We have now before us a full view of the dogma of baptismal egeneration. On the one hand, the performance of this rite s more powerful to save than subsequent transgressions are to destroy; and, on the other, its non-performance leaves both dults and infants to perish everlastingly! It is well for mankind and the cause of Christian holiness that such doctrines are not taught in Scripture. Augustine himself must have felt the want of a Scriptural authority for such *dogmata*, when he refers to an old and *supposed* 'apostolical *tradition*.' But it is an insult to our understanding to bolster up by suppositions, traditions, and Fathers, a doctrine which is said to involve eternal life and death. However, to give some plausibility to the notion, a few passages of Scripture are referred to, the chief of which we shall examine.

The principal texts adduced by Dr Pusey are the following —John iii. 5 and Titus iii. 5; but a careful examination, we resume, will soon show that neither of them sustains the views of our opponents. In the former passage our Lord declares, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' Now, that our Lord did not

* De peccat. merite est remiss. L. 1, sect. 34, quoted by Dr Pusey.

in these words speak merely of the ceremony of baptism, is evident from the fact, that he distinctly speaks of the Spirit. Had the Saviour intended merely an external ceremony, there would have been no occasion for Nicodemus to marvel and express his surprise, by asking, 'How can these things be?' for, as a Jew, with forms and ceremonies, with sprinklings and ablutions, he was already familiar. There was evidently a depth and spirituality in our Lord's meaning, which the carnal mind of Nicodemus did not perceive. An external baptism by water he sufficiently understood, but if our Lord referred to a Divine and spiritual change, as doubtless he did, there is no wonder that Nicodemus should not comprehend him; for 'the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.' Is it not the same carnality of heart which induces the Formalists of Oxford and their followers to contend so earnestly for the efficacy of external ceremonies?

Baptism is indeed important. As an institution of Divine origin it is of imperative obligation; and as a visible expression of weighty truths, as we shall show hereafter, it answers important purposes; but there is no conclusive evidence that our Lord referred to baptism at all in this passage. Though water is mentioned, it seems to be figuratively used for the Holy Spirit itself, which is immediately introduced as the object intended. Nor does this involve an offensive tautology or a departure from the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers. On the contrary, nothing is more common than for the inspired writers to employ, first a *figure*, and then, in the same sentence, to introduce exegetically the object itself; or, *vice versa*, first to mention the object itself, and then, in the same sentence, to introduce a striking figure of the same. Thus, when God says to Israel, 'Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings,' we understand but *one* duty enjoined—that of ceasing from sin. In the first clause of the sentence this duty is represented figuratively, and in the second literally. So, when God utters the gracious promise, 'I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring,' we have here not *two* sorts of blessings promised, but

one blessing under *two* representations—the first figurative, and the other literal and explanatory. All such passages illustrate the meaning of our Lord when he speaks of our being born of water and of the Spirit: the former is the emblem of the latter. What water does for the body the Holy Spirit does for the soul—it cleanses and purifies it. Thus, the passage affords no sanction to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

The other text quoted by Dr Pusey and his adherents is Titus iii. 5—'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' Though this passage is strenuously urged by our opponents, it is fatal to their cause. It is another striking instance of the custom we have already named as obtaining with the sacred writers—the custom of giving in the same sentence, first a figurative, and then a literal and exegetical, representation of the same subject. The subject represented is undoubtedly *one;* namely, that great *spiritual* change experienced by every true believer. This great change is first termed, figuratively, *regeneration;* then, literally, a *renewing*. This change is first ascribed, figuratively, to a *washing*, or to the *laver;* then, literally, to the Holy Ghost. Thus, the second member of the sentence is simply exegetical, or explanatory of the first. Some of our opponents endeavour to evade the force of this argument, by alleging that *regeneration* and *renovation* refer to different things; and that water is the instrument of the former, and the Holy Spirit of the latter. But this pitiful sophistry involves its authors in the following absurdities:—First, if the word 'regeneration' in this passage is not explained by the word *renewing* in the context, it is impossible to know what it means, as it is not applied to the soul in any other part of the Scripture. Secondly, if *regeneration* does not mean such a change as implies the renewal of the soul, it can indicate no change of any importance; for without such a renewal no man can enter heaven. Thirdly, if *regeneration* and *renovation* be different, then it follows that the Spirit is not the author of regeneration; for, on this principle, it is ascribed to 'washing,' and not to the Holy Ghost. Such are the absurdities which at first sight present themselves, as characterizing this sophistical evasion of the truth. But let the second member of the sentence be

considered exegetical of the former, then we allow the Spirit to interpret his own meaning; and all is clear, and harmonious, and in perfect concord with every other Scripture. We conclude, therefore, that the meaning of our Lord in John iii. 5 is—'Except a man be born of water, *even* (καὶ) of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;' and the meaning of the Apostle Paul, in Titus iii. 5, is that we are saved 'by the washing of regeneration, *even* (καὶ) the *renewing* of the Holy Ghost.' It is quite clear, then, that what the Puseyites regard as their two main pillars, will not sustain their edifice, and therefore it must fall; for if baptismal regeneration be not taught in these passages, it is not taught in any other.

While this doctrine is unsupported by the Scriptures already noticed, it is opposed and overthrown by a multitude of others, a few of which we shall notice.

1. It is disproved by the Apostle Peter, when he tells us expressly that the baptism which saves us, is 'not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.'—1 Peter iii. 21.

2. Baptism, as a Divine ordinance, holds the same place in the Christian economy as circumcision did in the Jewish dispensation. Both were appointed as rites to initiate mankind into the visible Church of God, and both were commanded of God; but neither of them was to be relied upon for salvation. For the Apostle expressly declares that 'he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.'—Rom. ii. 28, 29.

If circumcision had no more efficacy than this, it cannot, with any show of reason, be contended that baptism has; for both hold the same place in the covenant of God with man. Religion is always described as an *experimental* blessing, realized in the heart by the agency of the Holy Ghost; and, therefore, to make its essence consist in any external forms, is at once to deny the most explicit testimony of Scripture, and to contradict the most obvious principles in the philosophy of the human mind.

3. The notion of baptismal regeneration is disproved also by facts. If the ordinance of baptism itself *regenerates*, how was it that Ananias and Sapphira continued the subjects of pride, avarice, and duplicity, after baptism, even as they were before? And how was it that Simon Magus remained in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity? While baptism did not change these characters, neither did the want of baptism prevent Cornelius and his company from receiving the joys of salvation and the gift of the Holy Ghost; for these blessings were bestowed *before* the rite of baptism was administered. It is especially worthy of being observed that, important as circumcision was under the Jewish dispensation, yet God justified and accepted Abraham *before* he received that rite; and important as is baptism under the Christian economy, yet the first Gentile converts received the Holy Ghost, and with it all the blessings of salvation *before* they were baptized.—Gen. xv. 6; xvii.; Acts x. 44—48; Rom. iv. 9—12. God, in these events, designed to teach his Church, from the beginning, the important lesson, that religion does not consist in form, but in power; that its power is displayed in what is accomplished in the *inner* man, not in what is performed upon the *outward* man; and that its agency is the Holy Ghost.

If the rite of baptism does not constitute regeneration in adult persons, neither does it in the case of children. We believe in the Scriptural authority of infant baptism; but that it constitutes their regeneration, we utterly deny, and are astonished that such writers as Baxter and Wesley should hold a notion so totally unsupported by Scripture. 1. If infants were regenerated by baptism, we should surely have some Scripture where the doctrine is taught either by direct statement or by implication; but there is no passage in the Bible which favours such a statement. 2. If baptism produced regeneration in children, then it follows that those who are unbaptized are unregenerated, and, dying in this state, are left to perish; and thus myriads of little children must perish, either on account of their parents having neglected to have them baptized, or, being heathen, knowing nothing of the ordinance or the blessings connected therewith. 3. If baptism secured to infant children the blessing of regeneration, we should certainly see its fruits unfolded as the faculties of children become developed;

whereas, instead of the fruits of the Spirit, the poisonous berries of our corrupt nature present themselves. 4. If baptism had the efficacy of regeneration in children, their conversion in future life should not be called their regeneration, or second birth, but either their third birth, or their restoration from apostasy! The salvation of infants is secured by Christ's atonement, and depends not upon any external ordinance administered by man.

Errors in religion are always prolific; and while the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is unscriptural, it is productive of a host of evils too numerous to mention. It engenders deceitful hopes, by leading men to depend upon external forms, instead of seeking for the attainment of experimental blessings and personal holiness.* It invests the priesthood with a tremendous power—the power of giving or withholding the blessing of eternal life at their will. Such a power as this must produce pride, arrogance, and oppression in those who are supposed to wield it, and abject slavery in those who are made dependent upon it. With such a power God never did, and never could, invest any human being. This notion, too, is allied to transubstantiation, depends upon the same perversion of Scripture, and is commonly found in closest fellowship with this corrupt and irrational dogma. It has produced a spawn of monstrous superstitions, such as the using of salt, milk, honey, spittle, unction, imposition of hands, &c., in the administration of the ordinance. It involves also the dogma of apostolical succession; for if the sacraments possess such a tremendous virtue, of course they can be administered by none but consecrated hands, and none are to be deemed consecrated for such high prerogatives but those who derive their authority from the fancied line of apostolical succession. This notion, indeed, is one of the vital elements of Popery, and was one of the earliest germs of the Man of Sin; and as it springs from Popery, so it leads back to it; and hence its advocates are daily seen returning to the bosom of the Mother of Harlots.

* Thus, in consequence of this supposed efficacy, many were induced to postpone baptism until late in life, and some until the hour of death. St Ambrose, it is said, was not baptized until he was elected Bishop of Milan; and some of the fathers not until the approach of death. Constantine was not baptized until he was at the last gasp, and in this he was followed by Constantius; and two of his sons, Constantine and Constans, were killed before they were baptized.

The authority, import, subjects, and mode of baptism will be stated and argued hereafter, in a distinct chapter.

CHAPTER XIII.

ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION.

The believer is called to holiness. It is set before him as a privilege, purchased by the Saviour's precious blood, and made a subject of the most gracious invitations and promises. It is enjoined upon him as a duty, solemn and imperative, enforced by the highest authority, and the most powerful motives and obligations. 'Be ye holy, for I am holy, saith the Lord.' 'Follow peace with all men, and holiness; without which no man shall see the Lord.' It cannot, therefore, be unimportant to ascertain both the nature and extent of our privilege, in reference to our attainments in holiness in the present life.

The word by which holiness is most frequently expressed in Scripture, is 'sanctification.' The Hebrew word rendered 'to sanctify,' is (קדש) *kadash*, and the Greek word (ἁγιαζω) *hagiazo;* and the primary signification of these words is *to separate;* to separate an object from a common and profane use, and devote it to a holy and religious use. The object thus set apart and devoted is said to be sanctified—to be made holy. Take a few examples. In the institution of the Sabbath this word is used. 'And God blessed the seventh day, and SANCTIFIED it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.'—Gen. ii. 3. Thus the seventh day was set apart from the other days of the week, was blessed by God, and devoted to rest and religious purposes. In like manner, the Jewish tabernacle and temple, together with all the utensils employed in the rites of worship, are said to be sanctified. Why? Because, though formed of common earthly materials, like other objects, they were set apart, or wholly separated from common or profane uses, and appropriated exclusively to the worship and service of God. The word is applied in the same sense to persons, as well as to things. Aaron and his sons, and their successors throughout the whole period

of the Jewish economy, are said to be *sanctified*—Exod. xxx., &c. The persons chosen to this sacred office were *separated* from the common people, and from the ordinary pursuits of life; and, by various solemn rites, were *devoted* to their religious functions. For these reasons they are said to be sanctified.

The term thus used in a ceremonial sense is applied in a high spiritual sense to believers; and here its original ideal meaning is still retained, though refined and heightened—made to express a state intrinsically and really holy; for believers are *separated* from the world and sin, and actually *devoted* to the service and glory of God. The word being thus expressive of the gracious change effected in the hearts and lives of God's people, is extensively applied to them in the Holy Scriptures. St Paul, writing to the Corinthians, speaks of them as sanctified. 'Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.' In referring to the Divine transformation which they had realized, he says, 'Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.' The design of the Gospel ministry is declared to be, that men 'may receive an inheritance among them that are sanctified.' Addressing the Thessalonian believers, he offers up the following devout and earnest prayer in their behalf:—'The very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.'—1 Thess. v. 23. The passage just quoted is of special importance in the subject of our inquiry; for, while it implies that all believers are sanctified to a considerable extent, it teaches that it is their privilege to be sanctified in a higher degree—to be 'wholly sanctified,' and to be preserved in this state until the coming of the Lord. The doctrine so clearly taught in this passage is embodied and set forth in every part of the Scriptures.

That the believer is already sanctified in an important degree is manifest from his being born again, and made a new creature in Christ Jesus. He is separated from the *practice* of sin—that is, from wilful and overt acts of transgression; he has put off the old man, which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts; he has come out from the ungodly, and is separate, not

touching the unclean thing. He has no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but, by his life and conversation, reproves them. He is separated, too, from the *love* of sin. This is manifest from his repentance of it. He forsakes sin because he hates it, and abhors himself in the dust for having committed it against a God of love. He is separated, also, from the *guilt* of sin. Having fled to the blood of sprinkling, his conscience is purged from dead works, and he has peace with God. This state of pardon is properly called justification; but sanctification is a comprehensive term, and includes the whole of that spiritual change in our state and character which the grace of God accomplishes for every believer.

But the word 'to sanctify' expresses *dedication* as well as *separation*, and thus it expresses the fact that while the Christian is *separated* from the love, the dominion, and the guilt of sin, he is dedicated to God. His religion is not of a negative character, implying merely a freedom from sin, but the positive possession and actual exemplification of holiness. It is experimental and practical devotedness to God. His understanding, will, memory, affections, all the powers of his soul, are given to God. His body, also, is consecrated to his service. Indeed, this is implied in the fact that his soul is devoted to God. As the body is a piece of material mechanism, exquisitely adapted to carry out the desires and intentions of the mind, it necessarily follows that when the soul, the superior part of our nature, the source of thought, intelligence, and feeling, is sanctified to God, the body, as the servant of the mind, must obey its dictates, and act out its holy principles and affections. Thus the believer presents his whole nature to God as his reasonable service. He lives not to himself, but to Christ, who loved him and gave himself for him. He glorifies God in his body and in his spirit, which are God's.

Thus far, then, every believer is sanctified at the moment of his justification; and this state is inexpressibly great and glorious. The love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto him; and, as Mr Wesley (Sermon xiii.) observes, 'so long as he walketh in love (which he may always do), he worships God in the spirit and in truth. He keepeth the commandments of God, and doeth those things that are pleasing in his sight: so exercising himself as to "have

a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man." And he has power both over outward and inward sin, even from the moment he is justified.'

But great and glorious as this state is, it is not perfect. We speak not of *absolute* perfection, for absolute perfection belongs to none but God. We mean it is not so perfect a state as that which man may realize even in the present life. In freedom from evil, and in the acquisition of good, it is not so perfect as the believer may, through the grace of God, realize while in the present life. This is implied in the Apostle's prayer for the Thessalonian believers. They were already sanctified in a high degree, as the regenerated people of God; but when the Apostle prays that they may be wholly sanctified, his language clearly implies that their present state was not perfect, but that there was a state denominated 'sanctified wholly,' which was attainable even in the present life. He prays that they might realize this.

Already these believers were in Christ Jesus, partakers of his grace and salvation; but, as yet, many were only babes in Christ—his little ones, whose sins were forgiven them. A babe has all the parts and properties of human nature, but not the wisdom, the strength, the maturity of manhood; so it is in spiritual things. The babe has to grow by the sincere milk of the Word, and advance from a babe to a young man, and from a young man to a father in Christ Jesus. In the heart of the youngest convert there are all the elements of true religion; but in the nature of things these Divine qualities cannot as yet be fully developed and perfected. He possesses all the graces of the Holy Spirit—'love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance;' but they need maturity and strength. These plants are of the Lord's own right-hand planting, the produce of 'wholly a right seed;' but they must be cultivated by fervent prayer, and a holy, diligent use of Scriptural means; and they must be refreshed with showers of Divine influence, in order to expand, and grow unto perfection, and bear abundant fruit to the Divine glory.

In reference to such a believer in Christ, it naturally follows that his graces being immature, he is proportionately liable to sin. We say not that he is under any physical *necessity* of sinning, but that he is liable to it, and in danger of it, in pro-

portion to the weakness and immaturity of his spiritual state. For, in our physical constitution, in our natural temperament, in our animal passions and propensities, in the temptations of the enemy, and in the allurements of the world around us, there are incitements and influences which constantly expose us to sin; and just in proportion to the strength and activity of our graces, and the maturity of our holy affections and habits, will those influences be resisted and overcome. Where grace is weak, there is the greater susceptibility of evil, and the greater liability to sin. Where grace is strong—where love, faith, and all other virtues are vigorous and well-established, there is, of course, the less susceptibility of evil, and the less liability to sin, in either temper, word, or deed. Hence, says the Apostle, 'It is a good thing that the heart be ESTABLISHED WITH GRACE.'—Heb. xiii. 9. But Christians in the most matured and advanced state of religion are dependent upon Christ for strength and victory.

It is to be lamented that so few Christians live up to the high standard of their privileges and enjoyments. Hence the imperfections of professors in general, and the occasional manifestations of unholy tempers, and the exhibition of faults and sins, both in their spirit and conduct: proofs that they are not 'sanctified wholly,' nor bringing forth the fruits of grace to perfection; evidences that they are yet only babes in Christ, and in a measure carnal, and walk as men.

A just and careful distinction must, however, be made between wilful sin and those infirmities of temper to which even good men are subject. For in every instance in which sin is wilfully committed, or plain and positive duty neglected, condemnation is incurred, our covenant broken, and our union with Christ dissolved; nor can our recovery be effected without coming to God as we came at first, by true repentance, and faith in the atoning blood. And though even a good man may, in a moment of unwatchfulness, be overtaken in a fault, may stumble and fall, yet a state of habitual wilful sinning is totally incompatible with the Christian character. For 'he that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.'—1 John iii. 8, 9.

But while wilful and actual transgression thus severs our union with Christ, and strikes at once a deadly blow at the vitality of our religion, there is a difference with regard to those sudden scintillations of evil, such as pride, envy, resentment, &c., which, like sparks from the smitten steel, rise involuntarily in the mind. These evils, if not predominant and habitual, if not cherished and indulged, but, on the contrary, resisted, lamented, and abhorred, do not break the bonds of our covenant with God, nor deprive us of our interest in Christ. Sins they are, but not having the concurrence of our will, nor the approval of our affections, they do not destroy our confidence in Christ, nor rob us of our title to claim the relation of the sons of God. For the believer is not under the condemnatory power of the law, is not subject to the stern and inflexible exactions of justice, as Adam in his first estate; but is under the mild and merciful economy of grace—the sum of whose requirements is love. He was not justified at first by virtue of his fulfilling the law of works, nor does he retain his justification by virtue of a perfect obedience to the law of works. He was at first justified by virtue of an humble, penitent reliance on the atonement of Christ, and he retains his sonship by the exercise of the same principle. So that although his obedience be imperfect, yet while it is sincere; though his love be defective as to the measure of his obligations, yet while that love makes God its supreme object; and, though his faith be weak, yet while that faith clings to the Saviour alone—struggles to hold the hem of his garment, he continues justified, he retains his interest in the atonement, and the blessings it has secured. Imperfect though he be, and conscious as he is of it, he knows and feels that he is accepted through the Beloved, and is an heir of everlasting blessedness. We say these things not to flatter the hypocrite, or encourage the presumptuous, or apologize for sin. God forbid. But we speak thus to comfort the feeble-minded, to support the weak, and to give an explicit view of the doctrines of grace—showing that a man may be justified, though he be not 'wholly sanctified'—may be accepted of Christ, though he be not wholly free from inward sin.

Yet though such involuntary sins as we have just described do not exclude the believer from the Divine favour, and, consequently, should not engender despondency, they should, never-

theless, produce abasement before God, and urge us to seek, with unceasing importunity, for a deeper work of grace, for entire deliverance from these incipient forms of evil—for that fulness of love which at once casts out all slavish fear, and counteracts and destroys every antagonist principle. In a word, we should seek to be '*sanctified wholly*'—'to perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord.'

We have now proceeded so far as to elicit from the reader the inquiry, 'What is, then, meant by *entire* sanctification?' This inquiry we shall endeavour to answer in the fear of God, adhering with all fidelity to the teachings of inspired wisdom. For the sake of giving the subject as much distinctiveness and perspicuity as our limited space will admit, we may adopt the antique style of expressing our views, both negatively and positively. Negatively, we observe—

1. That entire sanctification does not imply a state of *absolute* perfection. Absolute perfection implies the actual possession of all possible perfection, and therefore excludes the idea of progression and advancement. Such a state belongs to no created being, either in earth or heaven, in time or in eternity. God, who is and always was infinite in perfection, cannot be the subject of advancement, for that would involve a contradiction. His perfection is absolute, and can neither be augmented nor diminished. But as all created minds are finite, and graciously formed for advancement, progression is the law of their existence, and they can never be absolutely perfect. It is their privilege to be eternally progressing, and yet they must ever remain at an infinite distance from the perfection of the Creator. We may improve in holiness through life, and after death go on from glory to glory, world without end. Hence, to fathers as well as to babes in Christ, the exhortation is given: 'Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.' In this respect the Apostle Paul reckoned not himself to have apprehended, but he pressed forward for higher attainments; and he exhorts believers of every grade in experience, the highest as well as the lowest in Christian attainment, to seek 'to comprehend what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that they may be filled with all the fulness of God.'

2. Entire sanctification does not mean angelic perfection.

We are not in the same circumstances as the angels, and are not measured by the same standard. God has made man 'lower than the angels.' They are in a higher state, and have, therefore, higher duties and responsibilities. Besides, angels are not in a state of probation. They dwell in a region of spotless purity; we live in a world of sin, sorrow, and temptation. Our Heavenly Father knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust; and he does not expect to reap equal fruit where there is so great a disparity in our condition.

3. Entire sanctification does not mean *Adamic perfection*—that is, the perfection of Adam in a state of innocence. Unless we had the same strength both of mind and body, as man had in his primitive state, it is not possible we can yield the fruits of holiness in the same degree of perfection. But both body and mind have become impaired and enfeebled by our degeneracy, and therefore the perfection of Adam cannot be realized in the present imperfect state. It is Christian perfection of which the Gospel speaks as our privilege, and not angelic, or Adamic.

4. Entire sanctification does not imply *perfection in knowledge*. Perfection in knowledge would imply infallibility; but no such state is promised to us. As there may be much knowledge without grace, so there may be great depths of grace with but a limited degree of knowledge. All sin may be expelled, though much ignorance on many important subjects may remain. At the same time, Divine knowledge, combined with love, is promotive of holiness, giving the mind more clear apprehensions of duty, more refined and delicate views of God's holy will. And while it is thus the tendency of Divine knowledge to promote holiness, it is the tendency of holiness to increase our knowledge of Divine things. Hence, the precepts to holiness are combined with injunctions to increase also in knowledge—'Grow in grace, and in the KNOWLEDGE of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

5. Entire sanctification does not imply a *freedom from temptation*. It is no sin to be tempted; it is only sin to yield to temptation. A state of temptation is compatible with the highest state of holiness; for Adam, in his primeval innocence, was tempted; and the Saviour, who knew no sin, was tempted in all points like as we are—tempted to a degree far beyond

that of all believers. He was tempted to forsake his mission for worldly honour, to selfishness, to presumption, yea, to worship the devil. However high our attainments in holiness, we shall always be liable to temptation, from a variety of sources, in the present life; and, perhaps, an exemption from temptations of every kind would be scarcely compatible with a state of probation.

6. Entire sanctification does not imply *an exemption from the danger of falling away.* It is true that, as grace and holy habits strengthen the mind, our danger of falling becomes less in proportion to our advancement in sanctification; but as we are in a state of probation while we remain on earth, we cannot be beyond the reach of danger, until we exchange earth for heaven. Hence the necessity for the strongest Christian to rely continually on God. Supported by him, we stand; depending on ourselves, we fall.

7. Entire sanctification does not imply the *extinction of our animal propensities.* It implies the destruction of sin, but our animal propensities and instincts are not sin. They are a part of our nature, inherent and essential to our constitution in this life. Adam possessed them in Paradise. The Saviour of the world had them. Papal superstition and fanaticism may stigmatize them as sinful, and seek their destruction by unauthorized austerities, but genuine religion never did. It is the abuse of our animal propensities which constitutes sin. It is their gratification in forbidden objects, or in an inordinate degree, which offends God and enslaves the mind. It is the province, therefore, of sanctification not to destroy these, but to control and regulate them, and render even the lowest instincts of our nature faculties by which to glorify the God of our existence.

8. Entire sanctification does not imply *incessant rapture.* Human nature could not sustain incessant rapture; our worldly avocations do not admit of it, and the highest state of religion does not promise it. We have no conception that heaven itself, with all its joys, will be one of incessant rapture. Freedom from slavish fear, and the enjoyment of peace with God, religion does promise, and they are always combined with a state of entire sanctification. But tears of holy sorrow, and pangs of spiritual anxiety, are quite compatible with this glorious state,

and are the most deeply experienced by those who are most thoroughly sanctified. Hence Elijah's grief, and Jeremiah's tears for Israel and Judah's sins. Hence Samuel's lamentations, and Paul's overwhelming heaviness, because of the guilt of their countrymen. Their elevated piety quickened their sensibility of the evil of sin, and kindled their jealousy for Jehovah's honour, and identified them with Him who wept over Jerusalem's sins, and groaned for the salvation of the world. Sanctification, therefore, is urged, not to gratify an Epicurean appetite for pleasurable excitement, but to make us like God—to transform us into his image. True, it greatly augments our happiness, but it also augments our sympathies, and gives intensity to our anxieties and griefs for the state of a sinful world.

9. Entire sanctification does not imply a *constant thinking upon God.* Some are ready to condemn themselves unless their thoughts are incessantly employed about God. But religion does not sanction their severity. Such a diligent attention to earthly business as is necessary to enable us to provide things honest in the sight of all men, is a part of our religion; therefore, to have our thoughts incessantly engaged with God is impracticable. Yet it *is* possible to have the mind every moment under the power of religion, giving such a bent and bias to our thoughts and affections that they shall always be in harmony with God's will, and the requirements of his Word. A man on a journey may not be incessantly thinking about his destination, yet every step he takes is tending thither. The purpose with which he set out keeps his face in the right direction, and carries him onward, even while other objects engage his thoughts. So a sanctified mind will be always tending towards God; the current of its affections will have a spiritual and heavenly direction; and the thoughts themselves, when relieved from earthly duties, will spontaneously revert to God, and delight to fix themselves on him as their appropriate object and end.

10. Entire sanctification does not supersede the necessity of *constant dependence upon the atonement for acceptance with God.* Christ is all, and in all. He is the only foundation of hope—the only medium of access to the Father—the only procuring cause of the blessings we receive; and however great the change which entire sanctification makes in *ourselves*, it

makes no change in our *relation to Christ*. It gives us no independent claim to the Divine favour, no inherent resources of grace. Through faith in Christ, we received at first the pardon of our sin and the Spirit of holiness. A continuance in the enjoyment of these blessings is suspended upon our continuing to depend upon him. If we withdraw our dependence from him, we cease to be Christians. We are separated from the true Vine; we become withered branches, twice dead. There is the same necessity for a Christian of the highest attainments depending solely upon Christ, as there is for a babe in Christ. Sanctification, indeed, promotes and increases a sense of our dependence upon him. In the degree we enjoy it, we see and feel our helplessness and unworthiness; are drawn from other objects, and constrained to more humble and implicit reliance upon the atoning Lamb.

Having, in these negative observations, guarded the doctrine from the imputation of erroneous sentiments, we proceed to speak *positively* as to its nature. An attention to the primary meaning of the word, as at first explained and illustrated, will, we think, render the doctrine easily understood. Sanctification, we have said, includes two ideas—namely, *separation* from an inferior or sinful use, and *dedication* to a holy, religious use. The believer, as we have shown, is sanctified already in a great degree, because he is *separated* from sin, and *dedicated* to God. Now apply the adjective *wholly*, or *entirely*, to this explanation of the word, and we have the nature of the doctrine expressed. To be sanctified '*wholly*,' is to be *wholly* separated from sin, and to be *wholly* dedicated to God. It is to be separated not only from sinful habits and practices, but from sinful tempers and inclinations—from sin of every kind, even in its most incipient form, so far as we are conscious of its existence; and it is to be so fully *devoted* to God, as that no part of our energies is diverted from his service by the intervention of any known sin of either heart or life. In the possession of this blessing the believer keeps the law under which he is placed in the economy of grace, by loving God with all his heart, with all his soul, with all his mind, and with all his strength, and his neighbour as himself. He is not conscious of any feeling or principle repugnant to love. Pride, envy, resentment, vanity, unbelief, and impatience under trials cease

to exist. His will is lost in the will of God, and all the graces of the Holy Spirit abound in his heart, and are exemplified in his life.

Sometimes this state is called perfect love: not only because love is the distinguishing attribute in its character, but is the essence of holiness. It is the root and principle of obedience, the fulfilling of the law; and this love, filling the heart, constitutes the glorious state of sanctification. It is the possession of love, even in a lower degree, which constitutes the difference between the saint and the sinner: and it is the fulness of this love which constitutes the difference betwixt a perfect believer and an ordinary Christian. The Apostle John tells us that love is an expulsive principle: that it casts out fear. 'There is no fear in love: but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love.' If love be the principle that casteth out fear, it is doubtless the principle that casteth out sin, for slavish, tormenting fear is sin; and if love cast out fear because repugnant to itself, it casts out every other sin, for every sin is repugnant to love. Thus the truths of the Bible always embody the soundest philosophy. The Holy Ghost fills the heart of the believer with love, and that love counteracts and expels all antagonist influences, and moulds the soul into God's image: 'for God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.'—1 John iv. 16.

These views are substantially in conformity with those of the venerable Wesley and the devout Fletcher. Mr Wesley says, Christian perfection is 'the loving God with all our heart, soul, mind, and strength. This implies that no wrong temper, none contrary to love, remains in the soul; and that all the thoughts, words, or actions, are governed by pure love.' Mr Fletcher says, 'We give the name of Christian perfection to that maturity of grace and holiness which established adult believers attain to under the Christian dispensation: and thus we distinguish that maturity of grace, both from the ripeness of grace which belongs to the dispensation of the Jews *below* us, and from the ripeness of *glory*, which belongs to departed *saints above us*. Hence it appears that, by Christian perfection, we mean nothing more but the cluster and maturity of the graces which compose the Christian character in the Church militant.

In other words, Christian perfection is a spiritual constellation made up of these gracious stars—Perfect Repentance, Perfect Faith, Perfect Humility, Perfect Meekness, Perfect Self-Denial, Perfect Resignation, Perfect Hope, Perfect Charity for our visible enemies as well as for our earthly relations; and, above all, love for our invisible God, through the explicit knowledge of our Mediator, Jesus Christ. And as this last star (love) is always accompanied by all the others, as Jupiter is by his satellites, we frequently use, as St John, the phrase "perfect love," instead of the word *perfection:* understanding by it the pure love of God shed abroad in the heart of believers by the Holy Ghost, which is abundantly given them under the fulness of the Christian dispensation.'

That a state of entire sanctification is the privilege of God's people, the Scriptures afford abundant proof. Indeed, there is no doctrine sustained by brighter and stronger evidence than this. Our limits will admit of only a brief review of this evidence.

1. God wills the sanctification of his people. This might be reasonably inferred from the holiness of his nature, and the benevolence of his disposition. But more than this, it is emphatically declared, 'For this is the will of God, even your sanctification.'—1 Thess. iv. 3. We are sure the will of God, thus expressed, is not to be understood as confined to *partial* sanctification, but extends to perfect holiness. The will of God is the tendency of his holy nature; and the same principle in the Deity which excites abhorrence to *any* sin must extend to *all* sin; and by the same disposition from which he loves holiness in any degree, he must love holiness in the highest degree. Unless it can be supposed possible with God to approve of sin in some degree, he must will the *entire* sanctification of his intelligent creatures.

2. God is able to sanctify us wholly. This, indeed, is necessarily implied in his will to do it; for, as God, his ability to do good must be commensurate with his disposition to confer it. This his word abundantly declares. He 'is able to subdue all things unto himself.' 'He is able to save to the UTTERMOST;' and to 'bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.'—Heb. vii. 25; 2 Cor. x. 5. There is no state of holiness the believer can sincerely desire, and ask in

prayer, but which God has power to accomplish, for he is able to fill us 'with the fulness of God;' and to do for us 'exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us.'—Eph. iii. 19, 20. Taught to entertain such views of God, how can we for a moment doubt either his willingness or ability to deliver us from all sin and perfect us in love?

3. In reference to accomplishing our sanctification, Jehovah unites his *fidelity* with his willingness and power. He is faithful and just, not only to forgive us our sins, but 'to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.'—1 John i. 9. When the Apostle Paul had earnestly prayed for the entire sanctification of the Thessalonian believers, he adds, 'Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it.'—1 Thess. v. 24. The fidelity of God involves the fact of his promise and engagement to accomplish this great work in answer to prayer; and that he has graciously bound himself by many exceeding great and precious promises we shall satisfactorily see hereafter.

4. God has provided in the economy of the Gospel for the full salvation—the entire sanctification—of his people. The character and efficiency of the redeeming dispensation are expressed in one word: 'Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.' But if the provisions of grace fall short of saving man from sin and restoring him to perfect love, the statement of the Apostle would not be true. Grace would not abound more than sin, nor even to an equal degree with sin. The moral effects of the fall would exceed the restorative grace provided in the Gospel. The disease would surpass the power of the remedy; and Christ could no longer be called a perfect Saviour. Such a low view of the Redeemer and his work is contradicted by the most express declarations of Scripture.

(*a*) It is plainly declared that 'the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin.'—1 John i. 7.

(*b*) The entire sanctification of the Church is described as the great object of the Redeemer's death. 'For the law of the Spirit of life hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh,

but after the Spirit.'—Rom. viii. 2—4. Thus, the righteousness of the law, so far from being abrogated, is to be fulfilled by the believer: because through Christ he is made perfect in love, and love is the fulfilling of the law. Speaking of Christ, the Apostle Paul says, that 'he gave himself, that he might redeem us from ALL iniquity.'—Titus ii. 14. What is meant by redeeming us '*from all iniquity*' may be seen by the ample description given in the next passage respecting the design of the Saviour's death: 'Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.' In the face of this passage, is it possible to contend for a *partial* deliverance from sin? Can any terms be more expressive of entire sanctification?

(*c*) A multitude of precious promises hold out the privilege of a full salvation—entire deliverance from sin. 'Let Israel hope in the Lord: for with the Lord there is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption. And he shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities.'—Ps. cxxx. 7, 8. 'And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live.'—Deut. xxx. 6. 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.'—Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27. This promise refers especially to the new covenant dispensation, and for its fulfilment the Holy Spirit has been poured out upon the world.

(*d*) Entire sanctification is *commanded* unto believers in the most solemn manner. 'Be ye holy, for I am holy, saith the Lord.' 'Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.' 'Finally, brethren, be PERFECT, be of good comfort,' &c.—2 Cor. xiii. 11. In the following passage we have precept and promise graciously united:

'Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.' 'Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from ALL filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.'—2 Cor. vi. 17, 18; vii. 1. The Saviour enjoins the command, 'Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart, with all thy mind, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'—Matt. xxii. 37, 39. We need not multiply passages of this class—they abound in every part of Scripture. When thus commanded to 'cleanse ourselves from *all* filthiness of the flesh and spirit,' are we at liberty to assume that God does not mean '*all*,' but a *part* of our sin? When he commands us to *perfect* holiness, are we to determine that he means no such thing? When the Saviour commands us to 'love God with all our heart,' are we to conclude that he means we are at liberty to fall short of this duty? Have we any warrant thus to pare down the precepts of our God, and detract from the obvious meaning of his holy Word? Let us take care, lest we are found among those who take away from the words of the Divine prophecy, and incur the plagues God has denounced.

(*e*) Believers are taught to pray for the blessing of entire sanctification. Our Lord has commanded us to urge the petition, 'Deliver us from evil.' Of course he does not mean a deliverance from *some* sins, or from sin to some limited degree, but from all, for all sin is 'evil.' In accordance with the efficacy of his own precious blood, which cleanseth from *all* sin—in accordance with the promises of his grace, which hold forth as our privilege the removal of every spot and wrinkle of depravity—in accordance with his own command, which requires us to 'perfect holiness,' we are here taught to pray for deliverance from *all* sin. The apostles prayed that this blessing might be enjoyed by the believers to whom they wrote. In a passage already quoted, St Paul prayed that Christians might be sanctified wholly, and preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord. He prayed for the Ephesian believers that they might be filled with all the fulness of God; and for the Christian Hebrews that the God of peace would make them perfect in

every good word and work to do his will, working in them that which was well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ.—Heb. xiii. 21. Writing to the Thessalonians, he prays that the Lord would make them to increase and abound in love, and that he would establish them in unblamable holiness. Such prayers must have sprung from a distinct apprehension that the 'perfection,' the 'abounding love,' the 'fulness of God,' the 'unblamable holiness' they sought, were attainable, were subjects of promise and duty under the Christian dispensation. And if such a blessed state was the privilege and duty of saints in those days, it is equally such to us, for we live under the same dispensation, and 'God is no respecter of persons.'

(*f*) The Holy Scriptures present us with examples of those who have realized this full salvation. Enoch and Elijah must have enjoyed it: they loved God with all their heart, and lived so as to be prepared for translation to heaven. The disciples on the day of Pentecost were filled with the Holy Ghost, and from that moment we see an amazing advance in their spiritual state. The selfishness, the vanity, the pride, the earthliness, the carnal jealousy, the unbelief, and fear of man, which before had so frequently appeared in their conversation, at once passed away; while their deep humility, spirituality of mind, singleness of purpose, undaunted courage, intense love for the brethren, unbounded liberality, invincible patience under suffering, and self-sacrificing devotedness to Christ, show that they were fully sanctified—that when filled with the Holy Ghost, love was not only ascendant, but reigned *alone*, to the extinction of every antagonist principle and affection, governing the whole region of the soul, and rendering life itself one continued sacrifice of praise. The benignity, the tenderness, the boldness, and spirituality of Stephen, as he stands before the council, bearing his testimony for God, or as he sinks to rest, imploring mercy for his murderers, show that his soul was filled with love to God and man. While his countenance shone as an angel, his spirit reflected the image of his Lord; and martyrdom itself seemed but a short and easy transition from the presence of Christ on earth to his presence in the heaven which stood open to his view. The Apostle John himself was a witness of the purity and perfect love of which he so sweetly writes. His Epistles are the breathings of a spirit freed from

sin, and matured in holiness. St Paul enjoyed the blessing of entire sanctification.* He was free from a repining temper, for he had learned in every state therewith to be content. He was free from vanity, pride, and unsanctified ambition, for he gloried only in the cross of Christ. He was free from every feeling of resentment, for he was ready to die an anathema for his enemies. He was free from selfishness, for he was ready to spend and be spent for those whose love diminished for him in proportion as his love abounded for them. He was free from covetousness, for he counted all things but dung and dross for Christ. He was free from unbelief, for he knew in whom he had trusted, and was persuaded that nothing could separate him from the love of Christ. He was free from the fear of man, for stripes, imprisonment, and martyrdom had no terrors —being ready to be offered up. He was free from the love of the world, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ. The absence of these corruptions implied the maturity of the graces of the Holy Spirit—the fulness of love. Indeed, it was that love which constrained him, which cast out fear, and counteracted every tendency opposed to its hallowing influence. Now, what was the privilege of Stephen, of John, of Paul, of Barnabas, and other primitive disciples, is undoubtedly our privilege. We contend not for the miraculous powers which accompanied the gift of the Holy Ghost in the fulness of his bestowment. Nor is this necessary. Miraculous powers are not essential to love. The gift of prophesying or speaking to edification, is greater than the power of working miracles, but love is greater than both; and this all believers may experience to the exclusion of fear and every other evil. The gift of the

* We are aware that writers opposed to the doctrine of Entire Sanctification have alleged that Paul himself acknowledged he was not wholly sanctified and have referred us to some parts of his Epistles in support of their views. The expressions of Paul, 'I am carnal, and sold under sin,' &c., Rom. vii., have been adduced: but in treating on Regeneration we have already shown that Paul was not describing his own experience at that time, but the state of a man convinced of sin, not born again of the Spirit. (See pp. 374—7.) The words of Paul 'Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect,' have been adduced as his own acknowledgment that he was not wholly sanctified. But the context shows that the *perfection* of which Paul was speaking was the final consummation of the Gospel reward, not of experimental holiness or perfect love for he immediately speaks of himself as being made perfect in this sense,—'Let us therefore, as many as be PERFECT, be thus minded.'—Phil. iii. 15.

Spirit was not designed to be a transient display of Divine goodness and power—a splendid manifestation of what grace could accomplish in transforming human nature, and then to be withdrawn. It is a new covenant blessing, the distinguishing glory of the Christian dispensation, and was designed to be the permanent inheritance of the Church on earth. 'For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off (to distant ages and nations), even as many as the Lord our God shall call.' Thus, the promise of the Holy Ghost in his fulness is designed to be coeval in extent and in duration with the calls and invitations of the Gospel—that is, it is for all nations down to the end of time. It is the possession of this Spirit, in some degree, which constitutes the character of the ordinary Christian; it is the fulness of this Spirit which matures and perfects that character. The disciples and apostles, prior to the day of Pentecost, had a measure of his influence; but on that day they were filled with the Holy Ghost, and were sanctified wholly, throughout spirit, soul, and body; and the grace which sanctified was able to preserve them blameless unto the coming of Christ.

Let us examine the leading objections advanced against this doctrine.

1. Many of our Christian brethren allege that such a state of holiness is impossible in the present world—impossible for a man to live without being conscious of committing sin in some way; either in his actions, or words, or tempers. But why is it impossible to live without sin? Why is it impossible to be made perfect in love? If it be impossible, the cause of that impossibility must exist somewhere. It cannot exist in the will of God, for we have shown that he wills our sanctification. It cannot exist in any deficiency on the part of Christ's efficacy as a Saviour, for we have shown that 'his blood cleanseth from all sin.' Every view we have taken of this subject overthrows the notion that this glorious state is impossible. God commands it: does he command and require that which is impossible? He promises it: does he promise a blessing which he knows he cannot give? He commands us to pray for it: does he require us, then, to spend our strength for nought? If we, being evil, know how to give good gifts to our children, can the God of faithfulness, holiness, and love tantalize and

deceive his creatures, by exciting false hopes in their bosoms and raising expectations only to be disappointed? Surely, of all *impossibilities* this is the most glaring; and we wonder how it is 'possible' for any man, especially any pious man, to entertain a notion so totally repugnant to the character of God and the most obvious principles of reasoning.

2. It is alleged that the Scriptures uniformly speak of believers experiencing a war between the flesh and the spirit; and such a representation, it is said, implies that there are remains of carnal nature which resist the graces of the Holy Spirit. This objection is based upon false reasoning. The senses and propensities of our animal nature are not sinful in themselves. They are a part of our nature, and existed in Adam ere he fell, and also in the Christian after he is wholly sanctified. Though perfect love casts out tormenting fear, envy, pride, and such like, it never casts out the natural wants appetites, and desires of our animal constitution. The sanctified believer no more loses these propensities than he loses the senses of sight and hearing; and the former are no more sinful than the latter. Both are perfectly innocent and useful. They are the gifts of God, and are very good. But though not sinful, they require the exercise of restraint, control, and government. They are a medium also through which Satan may tempt and the world solicit. It is, therefore, the resistance of these temptations and solicitations; it is the self-denial and the subordinating and keeping under of the appetites of our animal nature, which constitute the conflict between flesh and spirit. Hence the Apostle says, 'So fight I, not as one that beateth the air: but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway.' Thus the Apostle had to fight, yet he was fully sanctified: the conflict, too, was with his body, yet that body was not sinful. It is, therefore erroneous to call the animal propensities of our nature sinful except in reference to their excess; it is erroneous to expect sanctification to eradicate them; and it is erroneous to suppose a state of sanctification which will supersede the necessity of self-denial, mortification, resistance, and conflict. Therefore the argument of our opponents, being founded in error, falls to the ground. Sanctification renders the body a vessel of honour

fitted for the Master's use. It keeps every sense under proper restraint, never permitting the animal to subjugate the rational part of our nature, and thus we glorify God in our body and in our spirit, which are God's.

3. Our opponents adduce Prov. xxiv. 16, where it is said, 'For a just man falleth seven times, and riseth up again.' But this passage is totally irrelevant, for there is here no mention of sinning, and no reference to sin. Read the context, and it will soon appear that the wise man is speaking of the adversities into which a good man may fall, but from which God delivereth him.

4. Against our doctrine, the passage in Eccles. vii. 20 is quoted, where it is said, 'There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not.' But this text is capable of a satisfactory solution. It may refer to the fact, that there never was, at any period of time, a just man, a man regenerated, who did not at some time of his life sin, either in thought, word, or deed; and we have already shown that all men who are not wholly sanctified, who are not made perfect in love, are chargeable with inward sins of temper, &c.: but the passage does not say that it is *necessary* for a man to sin, or that man cannot live without sin; that man cannot be so thoroughly sanctified as to 'have a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man,' for we have clearly shown that the contrary is maintained in the Scriptures. There is another sense in which the passage may be received. It may refer to sins of ignorance. For as perfect love does not imply perfect knowledge, so a man sanctified wholly, and living without a *consciousness* of sinning, may still sin through ignorance. If his conduct be tested by that perfect law under which Adam lived when in the covenant of works, he falls short of its requirements, and in this respect may be said to sin; but if tested by the evangelical law of love, he sinneth not. Thus, this passage, in either sense, is quite compatible with the doctrine of entire sanctification.

5. As an objection to the doctrine of entire sanctification, it has been urged that St James says, 'In many things we offend all.'—James iii. 2. The force of this objection, if it have any force at all, lies in the supposition, that James is speaking personally, including himself with those whom he was address-

ing; but this is inadmissible, for it is customary to use the first personal pronoun plural *we*, when the individual speaking is not included; and indeed in cases where such a supposition would involve the most preposterous consequences. Take an example from the context itself. St James says, 'The tongue is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison. Therewith bless WE God, even the Father; and therewith curse WE men.' Now, on the supposition of our opponents, the tongue of this holy man 'was an unruly, untamable evil, with which he *cursed men*.' But this supposition is too gross to be admitted: yet it is just the principle on which men allege the former passage against the doctrine of sanctification. If, therefore, we are compelled to admit, that when St James says, respecting the tongue, 'therewith curse *we* men,' he is speaking not of himself, but of others to the exclusion of himself, we have a right to claim the same exemption for St James, when he says, 'For in many things *we* offend all.' The fact is, the writer speaks as men customarily do when they speak generally of human beings. But if St James had designed to include himself in that statement, it would not have disproved the doctrine of entire sanctification. The utmost it could prove, would be simply that he and those whom he addressed were imperfect; but no number of cases of unfaithfulness on the part of man could disprove that the privilege of perfect holiness was placed before them. As a proof that this writer did not hold the doctrine of our opponents, and therefore could not defend it, we find him exhorting believers to 'let patience have her perfect work, that they might be perfect and entire, wanting nothing.'—Chap. i. 4.

6. It is urged, moreover, that our Lord has taught us to pray for the forgiveness of our trespasses, and it is contended that a command to use such a petition implies a consciousness of continued transgression, and therefore entire deliverance from sin is not to be expected. This argument, also, is based upon a false assumption: for if men have ever transgressed at all, it is a sufficient reason they should be taught to pray for pardon; and as all men have transgressed, no form of prayer could be adapted to their state if it omitted a petition for pardon. But it is a sorry argument, that because men are taught to pray for pardon, they are to continue in sin. This is indeed the doctrine of 'continuing in sin, that grace may

abound.' The opposite doctrine may be clearly drawn from two petitions in this short formulary. For we are taught to pray that 'God's will may be done on earth as it is in heaven.' Now, as it is God's will that we should be entirely sanctified, made free from every spot or wrinkle of our old nature and habits, so the petition for the accomplishment of this will is a prayer for our entire sanctification. The other petition, 'Deliver us from evil,' teaches the same doctrine; for as all sin is evil, and as the Saviour intends our deliverance from it to be not *partial*, but *entire*, of course we are here taught to pray for entire sanctification.

7. We are told that the continuance of sin within us is necessary to keep us humble. But this sentiment is as unsound in philosophy as in theology. Is not pride sin? How, then, can the continuance of pride promote humility? Is not humility an essential part of holiness? How, then, can the perfection of holiness be inimical to humility? The more holy a being is, the more humble; and the perfection of humility is to be realized in entire holiness. There is no one so humble as the soul made perfect in love.

8. Some Calvinistic writers argue, that the existence of sin within us makes us long for heaven. But this notion is equally unsound. The essential characteristic of the carnal mind is enmity against God; but the essence of holiness is love to God. Which of these two principles, then, is the most calculated to make us long for God's presence? If the carnal mind is enmity against God, its influence in any degree is to produce alienation from God; and therefore the more effectually it is destroyed, the more free from that alienation. If holiness, or love to God, impel the mind towards him, causing it to delight in God as its chief good, *perfect* love—the love that fills the soul—will the more powerfully and abundantly urge the soul towards God, and excite the more intense longings for his presence and glory. Earthly-mindedness is always a concomitant and characteristic of a low state of grace. Heavenly-mindedness is always the attendant and characteristic of a high state of grace. Look at the aspirations of Paul, of John, and the other apostles! What a contrast to the grovelling views and affections of the great mass of professors! Besides, entire sanctification fits the soul for heaven, and it is natural that the

soul should desire the reward for which grace has prepared it. When the bride is ready for her spouse, she will the more eagerly hearken for his call, and the more gladly hail the day for her marriage to the Lamb. Holiness is resemblance to God, conformity to his will and pleasure, and therefore it includes both a desire to be with him and every other quality which God delights to behold.

9. It is alleged that the Canaanites were permitted to dwell in the land for the trial of the Israelites, and God permits sin to remain in our hearts that he may test our fidelity. We reply, that this fact in the history of God's ancient people, when properly understood, leads to the very opposite conclusion. The original design of God was the utter destruction of all those nations, and the command given to the Israelites was that they should be universally exterminated. And why were they to be thus exterminated? That the Israelites should not be 'corrupted by their evil example.'—Deut. xx. 17, 18. The cause why these nations were not utterly exterminated was the unfaithfulness of the Israelites, not the will of God; hence, the Lord inveighs against their disobedience, saying, 'Oh that my people had hearkened unto me, and Israel had walked in my ways! I should soon have subdued their enemies, and turned my hand against their adversaries.' Since, then, the design of God was the extermination of all these enemies, and their continual existence was the fault of the people, it follows that, so far as the case applies, it is all in favour of the doctrine of entire sanctification. It is the will of God his people should be free, entirely free from sin, and made perfect in love; and if they be not, the fault is their own. If the sins of pride, unbelief, envy, &c., still infest them, 'as pricks in their eyes, and as thorns in their sides,' it is because they have not been faithful. But let us not charge the result of our neglect and disobedience upon the purposes of God. He abhors such imputations. It is his will, even our sanctification.

10. Our Calvinistic brethren say that entire sanctification will not take place until death. Good Matthew Henry teaches this doctrine; and Dr Dodd says, in his note on Rom. vi. 7, 'The body of sin in believers is, indeed, an enfeebled, conquered and deposed tyrant, and the stroke of death finishes its destruction.' This sentiment involves many absurdities. It implies

that there is an unavoidable cause of sinning, arising from the soul's connection with a material body—the notion held by the numerous sects of ancient Gnosticism. But this notion is false. The connection of the soul with a material body does not render sin *unavoidable*. It is true that there are some sins which arise from sensual appetite, such as drunkenness, gluttony, lust, &c.; but there is filthiness of the *spirit*, as well as of the flesh, such as pride, unbelief, envy, &c. These latter sins pertain solely to our spiritual nature. Our opponents contend that death will deliver the believer from sin, because the body being dead, his animal appetites will cease to exist. But, in this, what does the believer differ from the profligate?—for his gluttony, drunkenness, and lust will cease when his body is dead. Besides, as death does not destroy our spiritual nature, we ask, What is there in death to separate such sins as pride, envy, &c., from the soul? Death cannot do it. Death is merely the separation of the soul and body, and if these sins be not removed before death they will cleave to us for ever. Therefore, if men trust to death as their final saviour, they dishonour the Redeemer, they trust without a promise, and will find themselves mistaken when the discovery is too late for a remedy.

11. Others, who admit that the blood of Christ alone can cleanse from all sin, contend that the entire sanctification of the believer takes place only a very short period before death. But on what authority is it so stated? We ask, Where is it written? We can find no such passage in the book of God. Besides, if this glorious transformation can take place a few minutes before death, why not a few hours? And if a few hours, why not a few days? Why not a few years? Again, such a state of holiness as is necessary just before death is necessary every moment, for we are every moment exposed to death, and know not when the Son of man may come, and summon us to the eternal world. Moreover, the blessing of entire sanctification is always represented as a blessing to be enjoyed and exemplified amid the activities of life. When we are commanded 'to perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord,' it is not said, 'do this at death.' When the Apostle prayed that the Thessalonians might be 'sanctified wholly,' he was not praying for people in the article of death, but in the midst of life and active

labours; hence, in the same breath that he prays for their entir sanctification, he prays that they might be '*preserved* in tha state unto the coming of the Lord.' Every view we take o the subject shows that the doctrine which maintains that entir sanctification can take place only in death, or just before deatl is both absurd and unscriptural.

In the Commentary of the devout Matthew Henry, th Christian is represented as aiming and striving for entire sanc tification, but never able to attain it in this life. Now, thi admits the fact that the Christian ardently desires the attain ment of perfect holiness. We ask our Calvinistic brethre seriously, 'Whence comes that desire? You answer, from Go alone. His Holy Spirit engenders that desire. We ask you then, Can the God of truth and love produce in your heart desire for a blessing which is unattainable? The fact of th existence of that desire in your bosoms, generated as it is b God himself, is a proof that it is his will you should realize it and if it be his will, it is most evidently your privilege.

Once more, we ask the pious Calvinist, Do you pray for thi blessing? Do you, in prayer, sincerely ask God to make yo free from sin *partially*, or *wholly?* Do you ask him to give yo only a measure of love, but not its fulness? You know if you heart be right, if your language express your desires, you *mus* ask for a *full* salvation, not a *partial* one; and if you emplo the language of Scripture, you *must* pray for perfect holines not for holiness in part. If so, the language of your prayer ac mits the doctrine which in theory you deny. Thus, your de votional sentiments contradict the dogma of the schools. Go is the author of the one, and man the author of the other. Ca you hesitate as to which is true?

As to the manner in which the blessing of perfect love ma be obtained, we believe with the venerable Wesley, that 'it wrought in the soul by a simple act of faith; consequently, i an instant.' But we believe, also, in a 'gradual work both pr ceding and following that instant.' While the apostles an brethren were engaged with one accord in one place, prayin for the gift of the Holy Ghost, they were growing in grace, y there was a definite period *when* they were filled with the Ho Ghost, and then they were sanctified. *Before* this perio Peter could say, 'Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowe

that I love thee;' but then he was made perfect in love—he loved God with all his heart, soul, mind, and strength, and his neighbour as himself; and the difference in Peter before and after this period is very striking. Let us, like the apostles, ask in faith, and the blessing shall be given.

We believe that this state may be lost, but we believe it is our duty and our privilege to retain it until the coming of the Lord, for God is able to make us stand, and finally 'present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy.'

CHAPTER XIV.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

A MODERN sceptic of some celebrity, in contemplating the question of a future state of being, uttered and published the following despairing exclamation:—'What went before and what will follow, I regard as two impenetrable curtains, which hang down at the two extremities of human life, and which no living man has yet drawn aside. Many hundreds of generations have already stood before them, with their torches, guessing anxiously what lies behind. On the curtain of futurity, many see their own shadows, the forms of their own passions, enlarged and put in motion; they shrink in terror at this image of themselves. A deep silence reigns behind this curtain; no one once within will answer those he has left without; all you can hear is a hollow echo of your question, as if you shouted in a cavern.'* Such is the despairing wail of Atheism! Imagine the world's population enveloped in this portentous gloom, and you see what infidelity, were it universal, would do for mankind. Think of every human bosom torn with such unavailing anxieties to resolve the awful problem of a future state, and you have some idea of the malignant influence of 'the Creed of Despair.' Let us now contrast this with the Christian's assurance of eternal life.

Dr Payson, writing to his sister a few weeks before his death, said—'The celestial city is full in my view. Its glories

* Holyoake on 'The Logic of Death.'

beam upon me, its breezes fan me, its odours are wafted to me its sounds strike upon my ears, and its spirit is breathed int my heart. Nothing separates me from it but the river death, which now appears but as an insignificant rill, that ma be crossed at a single step whenever God shall give permissio The Sun of righteousness has been gradually drawing neare and nearer, appearing larger and brighter as he approached and now he fills the whole hemisphere, pouring forth a floo of glory, in which I seem to float, like an insect in the bean of the sun, exulting, yet almost trembling, while I gaze on th excessive brightness, and wondering with unutterable wonde why God should deign thus to shine upon a sinful worm. single heart and a single tongue seem altogether inadequat to my wants. I want a whole heart for every separate emo tion, and a whole tongue to express that emotion.' Ami much bodily pain, which at times became excruciating, he co tinued to enjoy the same glorious prospect of heaven, the san transporting assurance of eternal life; and, shortly before h died, he exclaimed—'It seems as if the soul disdained such narrow prison (as the body), and was determined to brea through with an angel's energy, and, I trust, with no sma portion of an angel's feeling, until it mounts on high.' Suc is the Christian's hope—a sublime contrast to the dark unce tainty and despairing dread of the sceptic. It will, then, be work of mercy to the wretched unbeliever, as well as a sour of satisfaction to the Christian, to examine the foundations o which rest our hopes of immortal life.

Our inquiry is not whether the soul is destined to exist f some long but definite period after death, but whether it is live for ever. A few thousands or millions of years, or age are as nothing in the great problem before us. It is either a nihilation at death or an *eternal* existence—either an ephe eral duration, shorter often than that of a beast, or a life c equal with the infinite and ever-blessed God. This is assured an inquiry of the most solemn moment, and, as it concerns individually, it is not one of speculation, but of personal i portance. What, then, saith the volume of revelation, a what is the response of reason thereto?

1. *The soul's spiritual nature.*—In the Scriptural account the origin of man, there is a statement as clear as language c furnish of the twofold nature of man: 'And the Lord G

formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.'—Gen. ii. 7. Here the sacred penman narrates a threefold distinction in the creation of man, which indicates two parts in his nature—a distinction with respect to the time, the substance, and the mode, peculiar to each part.

Time.—The body was created *first*, and made perfect in its organization; but as yet there was no soul or spirit to actuate it. The soul was brought into being *afterwards*, and superadded to the body; and being superadded, it is not identical with, but distinct from, the material structure.

Substance.—The body was 'formed of the dust of the ground;' that is, of common earthly materials. But the soul was not formed of the dust of the ground, nor of air, nor of light, nor of electricity, nor of any other material substance, however ethereal and refined: and if not formed of matter, it must be distinct from it. And as it is admitted that there are but two substances, matter and spirit, it follows that the soul of man must be an immaterial substance.

The mode of creation.—The body was 'formed.' The original word *yatzar* (יצר), signifies to form, to fashion, or to model—a word in the highest sense proper to express the construction of a material fabric, such as the human body. But the soul was not fashioned or fabricated: its creation is expressed by a totally different phrase. It is said, 'the Lord God breathed into man the breath of life, and man became a living soul.' The act Divine, therefore, was not a modification of matter, nor was it the inflation of the body with vital air. It was an act of absolute creation, in which God brought into existence a vital, spiritual, personal essence, resembling his own nature. The peculiar phraseology employed in describing the operation is, perhaps, symbolical, intended to denote the intense spirituality of the act which God himself performed, and the immediate derivation of the soul from Him who is expressly called 'the Father of spirits.' So when our Lord would indicate the Divine inspiration of the apostles, 'He breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.'—John xx. 22. In a manner equally distinct from all material agencies, God gave to man by inspiration that immaterial and vital essence called the spirit.

Here, then, we have a threefold distinction in the creation

of the parts of our nature—a distinction in the time, substanc and mode, of their creation; and such a distinction as prov each to be essentially different in its nature and properties the one material, and the other spiritual; the one organize and the other unorganized; the one allied to the earth fro which it was taken, and the other to God, from whom it wa immediately derived, and whose nature it resembles. The sou therefore, though united to the body, actuating it and directin its operations, is as distinct from it as God himself is distin from the universe which he fills with his presence.

It is because the human soul is immaterial, as well as o account of its original holiness, that it is said, with redoubl emphasis, to have been created in God's image and likenes and for the same reason it is honoured with the same design tion as God himself. 'God is a Spirit,' and the human so is called 'a spirit;' and an infallible authority has affirme that 'a spirit hath not flesh and bones.' We are aware, indee that the term 'spirit' is derived from a word signifying ai breath, or wind, and this is the case in ancient as well as modern languages; but this derivation of the word detracts n from its spiritual import when applied to the human soul. F if it did, it would equally disprove the spirituality of Go whose nature is expressed by the same term. The truth is th the use of this term, in its application to God and the huma soul, arises from the poverty of language, and the inadequa of human conceptions, which necessitate the application physical terms to spiritual things. Air is an invisible substanc and because invisible was deemed the most unlike the gross elements of Nature, and the nearest in resemblance to pu spirit; and therefore this term was borrowed as the best r presentation of a purely spiritual essence. Thus the ter *ruach* (רוּח) *pneuma* (πνεῦμα), *spiritus*, *esprit*, and *spirit*, a applied to that immaterial essence which animates our materi organization; and for the same reason the same terms are a plied to God himself, the invisible, the immaterial, the se existent and all-glorious Creator. If, then, God is a pu Spirit, such also is the human soul.

So far as Reason can penetrate into the mystery of o nature, its decisions are in perfect harmony with the authorit tive voice of Holy Scripture; it shows us that the attribut and operations of mind attest its spirituality; for—

1. The attributes of mind are essentially different from those of matter. It is a fundamental axiom that whatever things are identical in essence are identical also in their primary qualities. Now, in examining the body, I find it has the primary qualities of extension, figure, solidity, and divisibility. But on examining my intellectual and moral nature, I find that I have the attributes of consciousness, understanding, judgment, memory, reason, volition, conscience, and moral emotion; and these intellectual and moral faculties pertain to myself as parts of my constitution, as much so as those that are material. Here, then, are two distinct classes of properties, and each class not only distinct, but so diverse from the other, that they cannot both belong to the same essence. They have, indeed, nothing in common. For instance, consciousness is a simple indivisible unity, but the material fabric of the body is infinitely divisible. Even the brain, regarded as the seat of the soul, and the organ of its various operations, is made up of an infinite number of elementary atoms; and an infinite plurality in the material organ is incompatible with the absolute unity of consciousness. No two things can be more distinct and different. They cannot be predicated of the same essence, but must be the distinct properties of two distinct essences—the one material, and the other immaterial. Moreover, matter has *figure;* but what relation have the intellectual and moral faculties to figure? Can I speak of the will as being square, or the memory oblong, or the conscience round, or reason as angular or oval? Can I measure such faculties by rule and square, and assign to them the various dimensions of a foot, an inch, or a line? The properties of matter and those of mind are evidently so diverse, that it is in the highest sense unphilosophical to suppose them as belonging to the same essence. Even Voltaire, ridiculing the materialism of Democritus and Epicurus, tauntingly asks, 'How can matter think?'

2. The unity and constancy of personal identity prove the essential difference between matter and mind. By consciousness I know that I exist, that I am myself, and am distinct from all other persons, and all other persons distinct from me. However numerous and diversified my thoughts, mental operations, and emotions may be, I feel them all concentrated in this one subject whom I call *myself.* This is personal identity. And farther, by the same faculty I feel that the facts of my *past*

history, however remote, when recalled by memory, are als identified with myself as their agent and owner, just as muc so as my actions within the last hour. Now this consciousnes of personal identity is totally incompatible with the materia fabric, because that fabric is the subject of incessant chang By the process of absorption, digestion, and assimilation, th body is continually receiving accessions of new material; an by the counter-process of secretion, perspiration, and excretio the same body is continually parting with portions of its sul stance; so that within the course of a comparatively shor period the whole body is changed, and the atoms which com posed the body, say at the age of seven, or fourteen, or twenty one, have passed away, and new atoms which once pertained t external nature have, by the process of digestion and assimila tion, become incorporated with the materials which build u our frame at a subsequent age; and within no two points o any considerable distance from each other can it be affirme that the body is absolutely identical in the composition of it structure. Even the brain itself participates in this continue change of particles as well as the other organs of our physica constitution. But, amidst all this material change, the min retains its consciousness of personal identity and of absolut unity. Though not a particle of the body may remain no which we had during the early period of our being, there is a invisible principle within which identifies the self of the pas with the self of this moment. The transactions, too, of th past, which are remembered, are identified with the same con scious self in both periods, though no part of the material orga of memory remain. We demand, What is it that maintain this unbroken unity, this absolute personal identity, under suc sweeping changes in the material structure? That which material it cannot be, for every part of the material self of th *past* is gone, and has no connection with the material self o the *present*.* What is it, then? To something this indivisib consciousness must belong; to something this continuous an absolute unity of personal identity must pertain; and if phys ology proves that it cannot belong to the body because the bod of the past is gone, it must belong to the soul or spirit; and it belong to the soul or spirit, it follows that the soul or spir

* See Dr Carpenter on the 'Principles of Physiology,' pp. 126—131.

must be immaterial and totally distinct from the body in which it dwells.

3. The independence and supremacy of the will are evidences of a distinct and immaterial essence which we call mind. Every one, and especially every one whose moral nature is cultivated, is conscious of that self-determining power we call *the will*—the faculty of voluntary action, or an inward force which gives effect to the combined dictates of judgment, reason, and conscience. By its exercise I can control the actions and resist the tendencies of the body. When the body, through weariness and exhaustion, tends to drowsiness and sleep, I can, by the energy of my will, keep it awake. When the absence of food, and the operation of the gastric juice, cause a craving for food, I can, by the energy of my will, resist the cravings of appetite, and prolong my abstinence from food. The animal propensities may incite a man to sensual gratifications that are unlawful, but, by the energy of his will, which is influenced by moral reasons, the solicitations of the flesh may be resisted. The body shrinks from pain, but the will, influenced by high moral and spiritual motives, determines the body to be racked, tortured, crucified, or burned at the stake, rather than we would violate a principle, or transgress God's law, or injure our moral nature. Here, then, are contrary tendencies, opposite interests, and contending claims—the one sensual, the other moral; the one mean, the other noble; the one animal, the other spiritual; the one influenced by bodily secretions, the other by rational and moral motives; the one supreme, dominant, regal, the other subordinate and subservient. Can these, so diverse and opposite, belong to the same essence? Nay, my consciousness itself informs me that that which governs the flesh is not identical with it; that that which wisely resists its tendencies is distinct from it; that that which subordinates its blind impulses to moral considerations is of a nobler nature; that that which subdues and overcomes the sensual to the spiritual and the unseen must itself be spiritual. This spiritual something is the soul, the conscious author of its own volitions, and the free, living possessor and agent of its intellectual and moral faculties.

This conscious freedom and power of the human will over the material fabric was to Dr Carpenter one of the strongest evidences of the distinct and independent existence of the

human soul. Hence, in his copious and elaborate work o
'The Principles of Physiology,' he remarks—'In the contro
and direction which the will has the power of exerting over th
course of the thoughts, we have the evidence of a new and in
dependent power, which is entirely opposed, in its very nature
to all the automatic tendencies, and which, according as it i
habitually exerted, tends to render the individual *a free agen*
And truly, in the existence of this power, which is capable o
dominating over the very highest of those operations that w
know of as connected with corporeal states, we find a bette
evidence than we gain from the study of any other part of ou
physical nature, that there is an *entity* wherein man's nobilit
essentially consists, which does not depend for its existence o
any play of physical or vital forces, but makes these subservien
to its determinations.'* That 'entity' which 'is not dependen
for its existence on physical or vital forces,' and subordinate
the tendencies of the inferior nature, is the soul.

4. Against this argument, it has been alleged by D
Priestly, Laurence, Atkinson, H. Martineau, and other mater
alists, that the functions of the mind are intercepted and eve
suspended by diseases of the brain; and that the process o
mental decay is in the same ratio as physical decay; and there
fore the mind is not distinct from the body, but only the resu
of life and organic structure. We reply that, if the premise
were uniformly true, the conclusions do not follow; for if it b
a condition of the soul's present existence that it shall ac
through the medium of a physical organization, it is onl
rational to expect, *à priori*, that its operations would be affecte
and sometimes even interrupted and suspended, by a derange
ment of the physical structure. A musician, however skilfu
cannot play to perfection if his instrument be impaired or ou
of order; and if the instrument be greatly damaged, he ca
only produce the most discordant sounds, or, it may be, h
operations upon it are altogether suspended. Yet his abilit
and skill are not in the least deteriorated by the imperfectio
of his instrument; because he is distinct from it, though d
pendent upon it for the melody and harmony of sound. Ju
so with the human mind: the physical organs through whi
it operates being diseased, its operations are irregular, inte
rupted, or, it may be, for a time suspended. But the inherer

* Dr Carpenter's 'Principles of Physiology,' p. 800.

powers of the mind are neither destroyed nor impaired by the imperfection of its material organs. When the eyes, by some accident or disease, are destroyed, the mind cannot see, but the inherent power of the mind to see remains the same; and if the organization of the eyes could be restored, the mental faculty of perception by vision would be brought again into exercise: so of hearing and of the other senses. Now, what applies to the *senses* of the mind, applies with equal force to the intellectual and moral powers. The organ of memory may be injured by disease or impaired by age, but the inherent mental faculty remains in all its force; and if the diseased organ be restored to soundness, the mental faculty of memory becomes again exercised: so of the other mental or moral faculties. Facts prove this beyond dispute, as in the restoration of suspended reason which occurs to the patient recovering from fever; and sometimes the lunatic is restored to reason while the brain is still diseased, and just before the final cessation of its functions by death. Often, indeed, the soul asserts its superiority and native independence in a remarkable manner, by performing its operations even when the brain is not only diseased, but when its very substance is partially wasted away. Dr Ferrier mentions a man who died of an affection of the brain, but retained his faculties till the last instant of life. On his head being examined, the whole right hemisphere of the brain was found to be destroyed by suppuration. In a similar case, mentioned by Diembroeck, half a pound of matter was found in the brain; and, in another case, half a pound of water. Mr Marshall mentions a man who died with a pound of water in his brain, after having been long in a state of idiocy; but before death he became perfectly rational. In a case stated by M. Billot, the patient lived till the eighteenth day, and retained his faculties until a few hours before death; yet, on his head being examined, not more than the bulk of an egg was found to remain of the proper substance of the brain. Besides this extensive disease (and even destruction of a great part) of the brain in general, it can be shown by numerous examples that the individual parts of it, the pineal gland, the *corpora quadrigemina*, *corpus striatum*, &c., may all be diseased or destroyed without affecting the intellectual powers.* What is the inevitable conclusion from these facts, but that the phenomena of

* 'Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal' for 1819.

physiology and pathology are directly at variance with th hypothesis of materialism, and in exact accordance with th sublime doctrines of natural and revealed religion?—that th mysterious part of our being, which thinks, and wills, an reasons, is distinct from the body?—that the physical organiza tion is but the temporary medium for its activity?—and tha the exercise of its faculties amid the very wreck of tha organization is evidence of its natural supremacy over matter

Nor is it true that the intellectual powers uniformly fad with the decline of life and the decay of the mental system, bu rather the contrary is sustained by indisputable facts. Lor Brougham observes:—'It is an undoubted fact, and almos universally true, that the mind before extreme old age become more sound, and is capable of greater things, during nearl thirty years of diminished bodily powers; that in most cases i suffers no abatement of strength during ten years more o bodily decline; that in many cases a few years more of decrepi tude produce no effect upon the mind; that in some instance its faculties remain bright to the last, surviving almost totall the total extinction of the corporeal endowments. It is certai that the strength of the body, its agility, its patience of fatigue indeed, all its qualities, decline from thirty* at the latest: an yet the mind is improving rapidly from thirty to fifty; suffe little or no decline before sixty; and therefore, is better whe the body is enfeebled at the age of fifty-eight or fifty-nin than it was in the acme of the corporeal faculties thirty yea before. It is equally certain that while the body is rapidl decaying, between sixty or sixty-three and seventy, the min suffers hardly any loss of strength in the generality of men that men continue to seventy-five or seventy-six in the po session of all their mental powers, while few can then boast more than the remains of physical strength; and instances a not wanting of persons who, between eighty and ninety, or eve older, when the body can hardly be said to live, possess ever faculty of the mind unimpaired. We are authorized to co clude from these facts, that unless some unusual and violen action interferes, such as a serious illness or a violent contu sion, the ordinary course of life presents the mind and th

* Though some may perhaps question this early period of the body's d terioration, yet the general facts must be admitted.

body running courses widely different, and in great part of the time in opposite directions: and this affords strong proof, both that the mind is independent of the body, and that its destruction in the period of its entire vigour is contrary to the analogy of Nature.'*

Even amid the prostration of wasting sickness, and in the very agonies of death, the undecaying energies of the mind are displayed by the Christian. Reason, faith, hope, love, joy, and all the elements of holiness, often rise to an altitude, and beam with a brilliancy far surpassing their average intensity, even at a time when some of the functions of physical nature have ceased, and when the rest are in the last stage of debility. As a writer in the *Eclectic Review* observed—'Oft when the action of the heart is scarcely perceptible, and the languid circulation has ceased to communicate vital warmth to the extremities—when the brain itself partakes of the general languor of the bodily functions, and death has actually commenced his work upon all which he can destroy—at the moment when, according to the zoological doctrine, the man touches the very point of annihilation; even then the spirit, undismayed and unenfeebled, exhibits all its moral faculties entire, and shows their total independence of the bodily structure in a manner that makes the sceptic half believe and tremble.'

Were the soul material and identical with the body, such facts as are here adduced could not occur; they could not occur even as exceptions; they could not occur at all. As the physical laws operate uniformly, constantly, and universally, the same physical causes producing always the same physical effects, the decay of the body would produce uniformly and universally the decay of the mind; the intellectual and moral faculties always sinking, fading, and ceasing along with the sinking, fading, and ceasing of the material organs, in an exact, unalterable, and unexceptionable ratio. But the facts opposing this are innumerable: they are constantly occurring; and their existence as facts corroborates the Scripture testimony—that the soul is not material, but is a distinct, spiritual essence superadded to the body, rendering man a personal, rational, accountable, and, as we shall see in our next argument, immortal being.

* 'Discourse of Natural Theology,' by Lord Brougham.

We now proceed to consider our next proposition, which is—

II. THE SOUL'S IMMORTALITY. In the investigation of this question we shall pursue the same order—inquiring, first, What saith the Scriptures? and then, What is the response of Reason?

The teachings of both the Old and New Testament on this subject are so full and explicit as to leave no doubt on the minds of those who revere their authority. Mirabaud does, indeed, represent Moses as being ignorant of the doctrine of the soul's immortality; but this assertion, like many others of the same author, is in opposition to the plainest evidence. Both Moses and the patriarchs who preceded him, yea, and even the fathers of the antediluvian age, had a knowledge of a future state of being. Can it be supposed that Adam, the primogenitor of our race, the federal head of mankind, created holy and happy, and with whom God conversed in the days of his innocence, was ignorant of this first principle of religion, and had no knowledge of the import of the life and death involved in the conditions of his probation? Did God teach him language, and inspire him with a knowledge of nature around him—give him, too, a promise of the Saviour, and yet leave him ignorant of his own immortality? The supposition of such ignorance is irrational. Unquestionably Adam knew full well the great truth of his immortality; and if he knew it himself, would he not, as a parental duty, make it known to his posterity, during the nine hundred and thirty years of his living in their midst? And could the doctrine thus made known be forgotten by the Church at a time when two men's lives were sufficient to extend over the whole period from the creation to the days of Noah? Did not the wonderful fact of Enoch's translation republish the doctrine of immortality and eternal life to all the world? Would not Noah carry the sublime doctrine from the old world to the new generations of mankind after the deluge? There can be but one answer to these inquiries. That Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew this doctrine, we have the clearest evidence, for it was the kernel of all the promises pertaining to the land of Canaan and the bright antitype and substance of those possessions which, though promised, they inherited not on earth: for they lived as strangers and pilgrims, seeking a better country—that

is, a heavenly one, a city out of sight, whose builder and maker is God (Heb. xi. 9, 10). Job lived about this time, and the hope of eternal life sustained him amidst the wreck of all earthly possessions, and in the prospect of nature's dissolution. As he sat on the dunghill, diseased, forsaken, bereaved, and ruined, he could raise his calm and hopeful eye to heaven and exclaim, 'I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.' —Job xix. 25, 26. To Moses it was revealed that God, who was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was 'not the God of the dead, but of the living'—that is, of saints actually existent then, though ages ago their bodies had been mouldering in the tomb. The splendour of Egypt's palaces paled before his enlightened visions of a better world, for he had respect to the recompense of the reward. The royal psalmist, joyfully anticipating the future world, says, 'Thou wilt shew me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.'—Ps. xvi. 11. Isaiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, and other prophets, bear witness to this great truth. The scenes of judgment, heaven and hell, impart a solemn grandeur to their prophetic admonitions; and the canon of the Old Testament closes with solemn allusions to that day of final retribution when God will 'make up his jewels,' and the characters of all shall stand disclosed, and the destiny of all shall be fixed for ever (Mal. iii. 16—18).

When our Lord appeared as the great Teacher and Saviour of mankind, he found the doctrine of a future state recognized by the Jews as one derived from the writings of inspired men; but he shed upon it the brighter radiance of that glorious dispensation which he came to inaugurate. The solemn truths of eternal life and eternal death permeated all his discourses, and gave pungency and power to all his appeals. In parable, and simile, and didactic statement, heaven and hell, judgment and eternity, were constantly placed before his hearers; and the value of the soul destined never to die, and the importance of preparing for a state never to end, were the central topics of his ministry. In his teaching, the body has no value compared with the soul; the present life no importance but as it affects the future state. 'What is a man profited, if he should

gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?' Moreover, He came to purchase for men immortal joy, as well as to offer it to their acceptance; and to save men from endless perdition, as well as to admonish them against its woes; and the immortality he taught in his ministry he finally confirmed by his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension to the heavenly world. In the ministry and writings of the apostles, the immortality of the soul and the contrasting conditions of the future world are set forth with noontide brightness and awful grandeur. In the Apocalyptic visions, which close the canon of the New Testament, eternity becomes unveiled—heaven is opened, the pit of Tophet is uncovered, and the happiness of the saved and the torments of the lost are depicted in the most impressive imagery. Thus life and immortality are brought to light by the Gospel.

In closing the Scripture testimony on the soul's immortality, it is only needful to state further, that this immortality is one of uninterrupted consciousness. There is no countenance given to the figment of the soul's sleeping during the interval of death and the resurrection. The dying thief was assured that he should be that day with Christ in Paradise. When the rich man died, in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments; and Lazarus was at once borne by angels to Abraham's bosom. For the Apostle Paul, to live was the enjoyment of Christ, yet to die was gain; because to be absent from the body was to be present with the Lord. To complete this evidence, some of the celestial messengers who appeared to St John in the isle of Patmos were the radiant spirits of departed saints; and the two favoured visitors from heaven who conversed with our Lord on the mount of transfiguration were Moses and Elijah. The latter had been translated body and soul to heaven, and the former was the spirit of one who died on the summit of Pisgah's mount. All these representations refer to the intermediate state—the state entered upon instantly after death—and they prove by the clearest evidence the continued vitality, consciousness, and activity of the soul after death, and its immediate entrance into a state of happiness or woe.

Such are the teachings of Inspiration. What is the response of Reason? The verdict of philosophy is in harmony with the Bible.

1. This doctrine is supported by the truth we have previously established—the soul's immateriality. Though the soul's immateriality is not of itself a demonstration of the soul's ever-during existence, it is a proof that the soul is an essence, a personality distinct from the body; and being distinct from the body, it may continue to exist when the body is dead. For there are but two ways in which a human being can perish—namely, dissolution or annihilation. But dissolution applies only to a substance made up of parts; therefore, by dissolution the soul cannot perish, for it is a simple, immaterial essence, and totally exempt from all physical causes of dissolution or decay. By annihilation it cannot perish, unless by the will of Him that created it; but respecting the will of the Creator on this point we know nothing except by revelation; and revelation declares that the soul shall live for ever. If, then, revelation must decide, the question is settled, the evidence is certain; and if philosophy be consulted, the evidence of revelation is sustained, by being divested of all psychological difficulties arising from the nature of the soul; for being immaterial it is exempt from all known causes of dissolution and decay.

2. The general belief of mankind in the soul's immortality is a powerful argument of its truth. Hope is the high prerogative of man. To believe in the future, as well as to be conscious of the present, is one grand distinction betwixt him and the inferior tribes of creation. And the noblest, the most elevating, as well as the most prevalent, expectation of the future, is that which refers to a state of existence after death. This expectation is, and always has been, all but universal. To enumerate all the nations, ancient and modern, which have held this doctrine, would be to fill our pages with a catalogue of all the nations of the earth, except a few savage tribes, sunk to a state of the lowest degradation, and who, in losing this sentiment, have lost all other knowledge by which civilized man is distinguished. All the relics of the past unite with the testimony of the present. Poetry and song, tradition and history, sculpture and paintings, monuments and customs, philosophy, superstition, and religions false and true, all bear witness to the prevalence of this belief. However far back we recede into the past, it is there; and however far we wander from the

great centres of civilization, it is there. However much nations may differ from each other in modes of thought forms of government, or habits of life, they agree in this: that the thinking principle in man shall continue to live after the body is dead. They may connect with this belief many absurd and foolish notions; but the belief itself is the universal substratum, the elementary principle underlying and pervading all their views of man's future destiny. Even those philosophers so called, who have professed to doubt the doctrine, form but a trifling exception to the general voice of mankind, and their feeble reasonings are vitiated by the rejection of its cognate doctrine—the existence of God. It may, therefore, be affirmed that the belief in the future existence of man is co-existent and co-extensive with man's belief in the existence of a Deity.

This universal belief is a fact which must be accounted for; but it cannot be rationally accounted for, without admitting the truth of the proposition believed. To deny it, is to maintain that mankind in all ages, the wise and the simple, the good and the bad, have been all but unanimous in the belief of a lie. But how this lie could be originated, how it has been so long perpetuated, and how it still sways the opinions of the world, no sceptic, however bold and ingenious, has been able to show. Cicero affirms that 'the consent of all nations is to be accounted the law of nature, and to resist it is to resist the voice of God.'* The same author, though a heathen, was so forcibly impressed with the evidence of the soul's immortality and the universality of its belief, that he regarded it as an *innate* truth, a truth pertaining to our very nature as human beings. And truly, if not innate, there are but two other sources whence it could have derived its origin, and maintained its perpetuity and universality—namely, the clearest deductions of reason, or the authority of revelation. If from revelation, its truth is admitted; and if from reason, its universal acceptance in all ages and countries, proclaims its evidence to be so complete as to command universal assent: in either case unbelief is irrational.

3. The desire for immortality and the dread of annihilation are in harmony with this doctrine. If the belief of the soul's immortality be not *absolutely* universal, yet the *desire* for it

* 'De Leg,' cap. 1; 'Tus. Quæst.,' cap. 1.

universal. Even the sceptic and the atheist are no exceptions here; for men's desires go further than their hopes; and when a desire is natural, adverse speculation cannot extinguish it. Deny it men may, but the desire for it can only be extinguished by the fear that is engendered by vice or insanity. Although the opinion of Cicero, that the belief of the soul's immortality is an innate principle, may be disputed, yet that the desire for it is natural, and is an inbred principle, is not possible to be questioned, except by men who deny the testimony of their own consciousness. Nor is this desire a mark of imperfection in our nature. It is the ally of goodness, it is a restraint on evil, and an incentive to virtue—a principle which refines and ennobles our nature. Hence it springs from a noble instinct which God has implanted within us, and is absolutely universal. Even the wretched suicide forms no exception to the universality of this law of our being; for there was a period when it actuated him as well as other men, and it never left him until either vice had engendered despair of future happiness, or some mental disease had removed him from the normal condition of human nature.

The virtuous heathen, though not enlightened by the Gospel, were animated with the desire for immortality, and some of their remarkable sayings have come down to our times. Xenophon, the polished Grecian annalist, tells us that Cyrus thus addressed his sons as he lay on the bed of death:—'Do not imagine, oh, my dear children, that when I leave you I shall cease to exist. For even when I was yet with you, my spirit you could not discern; but that it animated this body, you were fully assured by the actions which I performed. Be assured it will continue the same, though you see it not. I can never suffer myself to be persuaded that man lives only while he is in the body, and dies when it is dissolved, or that the soul loses all intelligence on being separated from an unintelligent lump of clay; but rather that, on being liberated from all mixture with the body, pure and entire, it enters upon its true intellectual existence.' * Plato describes Socrates, prior to his taking the fatal cup from the hand of the executioner, as calmly discussing with his friends on the soul's immortality as the hope and reward of the virtuous and the good.† After

* Xenophon on the 'Institution of Cyrus.' † Platonis 'Phædo.'

assigning various degrees of punishment to the wicked, he says:—'Those who have passed through life with peculiar sanctity of manners are received on high into a pure region where they live without their bodies to all eternity, in a series of joys and delights which cannot be described.'

Cicero, the great Roman orator, whose confident opinion of the soul's immortality has before been adverted to, represents Cato thus addressing his young friends Scipio and Lælius:—'No one shall persuade me, Scipio, that your worthy father, or your grandfathers Paulus and Africanus, or many other excellent men whom I need not name, performed so many actions to be remembered by posterity, without being sensible that futurity was their right. And if I may be allowed an old man's privilege to speak for myself, can you imagine that I should have submitted to so much painful toil by night and by day, in the forum, in the senate, and in the field, had I apprehended that my existence and reputation were to terminate with this life? Were this the case, to have worn out my days with ease and tranquillity, free from labour and without emulation were far more desirable. But I know not how, the soul has always raised itself, and, exerting its native vigour, has still sprung forward into ages yet to come, and seized them as its own. I feel myself transported with delight at the thought of again seeing and joining your father, whom on earth I highly respected and dearly loved; and borne on the wings of hope and desire, I am speeding my flight to mingle with the honoured society, not of those only with whom I have on earth conversed, but of those also of whom I have heard and read, and the history of whose lives I myself have written for the instruction of mankind. Oh, glorious day! when I shall be admitted into the assembly of the wise and the good; when I shall make an eternal escape from this sink of corruption and this din of folly; when, amidst the happy throng of the immortals, I shall find thee also, my son, my Cato, best, most amiable of men. On thy ashes I bestowed the honours of the tomb. Ah, why did not mine receive them from thy hand? But your spirit, I know it, has never forsaken me; but, casting back a long, lingering look to your afflicted father, has removed to the region of purity and peace, whither you were confident

should shortly follow you; and I feel, I feel that our separation cannot be of long continuance.'*

Seneca, the Roman philosopher, administers consolation to Marcia under the loss of her son, by reminding her of the soul's existence after death, and its immortal happiness, saying —'The sacred assembly of the Scipios and Catos, who have themselves despised life, and obtained freedom by death, shall welcome the youth to the region of happy souls. Your father himself (for all are there known to all) shall embrace his grandson, and shall direct his eyes, now furnished with new light, along the courses of the neighbouring stars, with delight, explaining to him the mysteries of Nature, not from conjecture, but from certain knowledge. Like a welcome guide in an unknown city, he will unfold to the inquiring stranger the causes of the celestial appearances.'†

Such desires and hopes of future existence were cherished by heathens in the immediate prospect of death; and though not always nor generally associated with such animating prospects, yet the desire for continued existence is a natural instinct, and therefore universal.

Admitting, as reason compels us to do, that this desire for perpetual life, and this dread of annihilation, spring from a natural instinct, it follows that God himself is its author; and if God is its author, it must be adapted to man's nature; and if adapted to man's nature, the object desired must be real and not fictitious. There is no escape from this conclusion, unless we impeach the wisdom and goodness of the Creator, and argue that he has deceived us with respect to our highest nature and most important interests. But such an unworthy view of God is disproved by all the demonstrations of his wisdom and goodness towards our inferior interests, and towards all the lower tribes of creation. In the economy of physical nature, I see perfect adaptation everywhere. The structure of birds, beasts, and fishes is adapted to the elements in which they reside, and all the habits of their being; every instinct has its appropriate object and gratification. Nothing is contradictory, discordant, out of place, or even unnecessary. I see the same wisdom and goodness in the economy of my own physical nature. Does

* Cicero 'De Senectute.' † 'Ad Marciam,' c. 25.

God provide for the instincts which he gives to beasts and reptiles, and leave the noble aspirations of my soul to be disappointed? Is he good immensely in providing for the wants and true, as well as good, in gratifying the innocent appetites of my inferior nature, and not so with regard to my soul? Does he deceive me by exciting hopes that are illusive, and implanting desires that are only to be mocked? Has the God of holiness and truth implanted within me an instinct to believe a lie? Does he teach me to be upright and sincere in all my dealings, and does he himself impose upon all the intelligent beings he has made by one continuous and universal deception? Our reason and our moral sense repel the blasphemous insinuation with abhorrence. We believe our Maker to be absolutely true, wise, and benevolent; and as we believe nature to be an exponent of his truth, wisdom, and goodness, we are assured that the natural desire for future life shall be realized in the perpetuity and eternity of our spiritual being.

4. The voice of conscience speaks to man of a future state of existence. By conscience we mean that inward tribunal by which our own character is judged, and our daily conduct approved or condemned. Every man knows what this is by his own consciousness. It is a faculty universal in human nature. Its existence depends not on the Gospel, for it prevails, though not with the same force, among Jews, Mahometans and Heathens. It depends not on national or civil laws, or on public opinion, for it takes cognizance of actions that come not under the operation of any human code; of actions unseen by the human eye; and of thoughts, purposes, and motives hidden in the recesses of the heart. It not only *judges* our personal character, but rewards with approval and punishes with remorse, according to our conduct. It lashes the flattered villain as with a whip of scorpions, and makes him writhe in anguish when no one sees him but the eye of God; and it supports the good with its complacent smile, even amidst sufferings, reproaches, and martyrdom. Whence comes this impartial judge whom no gifts can bribe, no flattery can silence? Is it of our own creating? Nay, we cannot create, and can hardly destroy this inward power. It comes unbidden, and abides, despite our efforts to force away its unwelcome presence. Thousands try to escape this impartial judge, but they cannot; he clings to

them with the tenacity of their own personal identity. It is what Sophocles calls 'the unwritten law which always lived, no one knowing whence it came;' * and which law, Cicero says, 'we have not learned, or received, or read, but derived from Nature itself;' which he dignifies with the title of 'a law, both human and Divine;'† and which a still higher authority has designated, 'the law written on the heart;' ‡ and it proves its Divine origin by echoing the will of God, by enforcing the virtue he approves, and restraining the vices which he condemns. But if conscience be the utterance of God's law, it proclaims my responsibility to God himself; and my responsibility to him implies that I am amenable to his tribunal, of which the voice of conscience is but a faint and imperfect echo. And if I am responsible to the tribunal of God, this truth, by logical necessity, involves another truth—namely, that I must exist in another state where a full and complete award shall be dispensed.

This great truth derives no small confirmation from the opposite theory of materialism, which not only reduces man in the scale of being to a mere animal, but sinks him to a mere machine, and divests him of all responsibility for his actions. Henry G. Atkinson and H. Martineau proclaim the odious immorality of the Materialist's system, with a degree of unblushing effrontery equal to that of any Epicurean of ancient days, or of any Socialist in modern times. They say, 'Instinct, passion, thought, &c., are the effects of organized substances.' 'All causes are material causes.' 'In material conditions, I find the origin of all religions, all philosophies, all opinions, and "spiritual conditions and influences," in the same manner that I find the origin of all diseases, and of all insanities, in material conditions and causes.' 'I am what I am; a creature of necessity; I claim neither merit nor demerit.' 'I feel that I am as completely the result of my nature, and impelled to do what I do, as the needle to point to the north, or the puppet to move as the string is pulled.' 'I cannot alter my will, or be other than what I am, and cannot deserve either reward or punishment.'§ It is well when the advocates of a system avow its

* Νόμιμα ἄγραπτα. Soph. 'Antig.'
† Cicero 'De Officiis,' lib. iii. 27. ‡ Rom. ii. 15.
§ 'Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Development.'

results as well as its nature; for then we may judge of its true character. Here, then, we see what the theory of the materialist really is—its absurdity and its immorality are apparent at the same time. It contradicts the most palpable and self-evident truth, for every man is conscious that he is responsible for his own actions. It contradicts all laws; for the laws of all nations, ancient and modern, hold man responsible for his conduct. It saps the foundation of all morals, and lets in a flood of vice and immorality. Society could not exist under this licentious system. It would convert the earth into a Pandemonium of evil and an Aceldama of woe. Its immorality is only equalled by its absurdity. The rejection of this horrid blasphemy involves the admission of the opposite truths. Man has a soul; man is responsible; man is destined to a future state of existence. This truth will derive augmented confirmation from our next proposition.

5. The inadequate retribution of Providence in the present life is evidence of a future state, wherein that retribution will be adequate and complete. Every one who admits the being of God must admit that he is benevolent and holy; and, being benevolent and holy in his nature, must be holy and righteous in his government. But whoever takes a survey of the past and present state of the world, cannot avoid seeing that there is not a consummation of the principles of equity and justice in this life. We do, indeed, see even now such a line of demarcation between the righteous and the wicked—such an obvious connection between vice and misery, on the one hand and between virtue and happiness on the other—as convince us that a just and holy God does govern the world; but the exceptions are numerous, and the consummation of perfect equity admits of no exceptions. In looking around us, what do we behold? Virtue depressed, vice flourishing, innocence murdered, and guilt unpunished. Yonder a benefactor is traduced, imprisoned, tortured, crucified: there a tyrant, by fire and sword, slaughters thousands and desolates nations; yet he prospers and dies in honour, and after death is deified as a hero. Poverty, reproaches, and sufferings are oft the lot of the excellent of the earth; riches, honour, and pleasure are oft the portion of the most profligate and abandoned. Human laws, however complete, do not recognize one-tenth part of human

vices; and when they do recognize them, they are imperfectly administered. The ends of justice are being continually frustrated, and sometimes even reversed. Nineteen-twentieths of crime escape punishment, and not unfrequently the innocent suffer for the guilty. This is the case now, and the case everywhere even under the most effective administration; it has always been the case from the beginning of time, and it will probably continue to be the case in years to come. Do these irregularities occur under the government of a righteous God? Unquestionably they do. Is this, then, the end of his administration? Is this the final display of his equity and benevolence? Impossible. Reason recoils from the supposition. The Judge of all the earth will do right. Omniscience sees all deeds, and understands all hearts; perfect wisdom weighs all characters, and determines the proportionate demerit of all crimes; perfect benevolence regards with approval all virtue and goodness; perfect equity is impartial and universal; and a perfect government admits of no laxity, no indifference, no exceptions, in its administration. Hence the absolute certainty that no crime shall escape due punishment, and no virtue shall be left unrewarded. But as this perfect administration takes not effect now, there must be another state when it shall take effect. Thus the wisdom, equity, and goodness of God, in the administration of his own laws, necessitates a future state of being, when he will render to every man according to his works.

6. The vast capacities of the human soul afford evidence of its immortality. God has endued the human mind with capacities to which no definite limitation can be assigned. He has given to man the faculty of understanding for the acquisition of knowledge, and memory as the faculty for retaining it; and God himself is man's Instructor. In the ample volumes of Creation and Providence, God has published some of his great thoughts, and the mind of man reads them and treasures them up. The universe, indeed, is one great panorama, crowded with instructive objects, from which God gives to man lessons on geometry, dynamics, optics, astronomy, chemistry, geology, and the various other sciences; and the mind of man delights to ponder and resolve the sublime problems which are spread before it for contemplation. What, indeed, are all the sciences,

but so many classifications of great truths which existed from all eternity in the mind of God, and have become transfused through Nature into the mind of man? To these displays of wisdom revelation adds its wonderful discoveries of God himself, his nature, his attributes, perfections, and personal distinctions. In a word, the works of God's hand, the resources of his nature, and the facts of his moral government, are treasures of knowledge absolutely unlimited: eternity itself cannot exhaust them.

With these inexhaustible sources of knowledge before and around us, the mind itself is endued with powers that know no bounds. In childhood it begins the work of inquiry and research; in youth and manhood it advances; its stores accumulate with age; and it would never cease, or be retarded in its progress, unless arrested by physical decay. In this respect the human mind is unique; it has neither compeer, rival, nor resemblance, within the range of visible creation. The seed we sow vegetates, grows up, but finds its perfection and limit in the fruit which it yields. Animal instinct finds its appropriate gratification within a narrow range, and the most sagacious among the brutal animals have no power of expansion, refinement, or elevation. With them knowledge is confined within prescribed limits; they can take in but few notions, however sedulously taught. Fixed limits bound everything but the human mind. Here, however, is no limit. He that made it bids it grow, and it grows—not like vegetation, to fade, nor, like the animal's perception, to be arrested—but it grows to grow again. Every new attainment becomes but a higher platform for a still loftier ascent; and when interrupted by disease or old age, the interruption is in the material organism, and not in the mind itself. The mind fades not, it wearies not, and the presumption is that, with an imperishable organization, it would advance for ever; or, if liberated from all material restraints, would advance and expand in knowledge throughout eternity.

The capacity for perpetual attainment involves an evidence of perpetual existence. If there be adaptation and harmony in the works of God; if there be the same wisdom in the constitution of mind as there is in matter; if there be the same goodness towards the noblest as there is towards the most in-

ferior of God's works, then the immortality of the soul is not problematical, it is certain. The world of unorganized matter fulfils its entire destination; the vegetable tribes answer every purpose for which their respective nature is fitted; the animal creation finds a sphere for the development of every power in its organization, its instincts, and its being. It has no desire for future being, no notion of it, and its short existence disappoints no hopes. Were its life prolonged to a thousand years, it could make no advancement; its brief existence, therefore, is ample for the development of every power, and the fulfilment of every purpose involved in its nature.

> 'Their little all
> Flows in at once. In ages they no more
> Could know, or do, or covet, or enjoy.'

But not so with man. The duration of this life does but introduce him to the vestibule of the great temple of Nature; does but give him time to lisp the alphabet of the stupendous volume that lies unrolled before him; and scarcely affords him a moment to fledge his intellectual pinions for their marvellous and boundless flight.

> 'Those numerous worlds that throng the firmament,
> And ask more room in heaven, can roll at large
> In man's capacious thought, and still leave room
> For ampler orbs, for new creations there.
> * * * * *
> Were man to live coeval with the sun,
> The patriarch pupil would be learning still;
> Yet dying, leave his lesson half unlearn'd.'

Can it be, then, that God has given to man the capacities of an archangel, with less than the duration of a beast? Has he endued him with powers unlimited, to be immediately extinguished? Has he ennobled him with the lineaments of his own image, to be blotted from existence the moment they begin to be unfolded? Do unconscious suns and systems roll on for ages, and the insentient materials of earth pass through many cycles, and retain their being unimpaired, and is the only spiritual essence that is capable of unfolding their operations and laws to be in a moment destroyed? Is every atom of rude matter to be spared from annihilation, and yet the only being capable of intelligently contemplating its glorious Creator, of reflecting his image, of obeying his laws, and rejoicing in his

favour, to be consigned to everlasting destruction? Impossible! Reason repels the thought, as unworthy of God. The wisdom that has imparted harmony everywhere cannot create discordance here. The wisdom that adapts everything for its place, and the goodness that causes everything to develop its powers, guarantee the certainty that the soul shall have an existence co-equal with its intellectual and moral faculties; and as these are unlimited, so the duration of its being can have no bounds.

Here we must conclude our argument. We have seen that the soul is spiritual in its nature, and therefore exempt from all known causes of dissolution; that the belief in its immortality is a universal sentiment; that the desire for continued existence is an instinct implanted in every breast; that the attributes of conscience afford the expressions of the Creator's law, and are a premonition of a future retribution; that the unequal recompense administered in this life requires, from a wise and righteous Governor, life beyond this, where character and condition shall correspond with each other; and finally, we have seen that unlimited capacity requires unbounded existence. Each truth of itself is an argument for the soul's immortality, but when all are united, they amount to a moral demonstration. Thus reason conjoins with Holy Scripture in affirming that the soul of man shall live for ever.

CHAPTER XV.

THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY PROVED TO BE UNSCRIPTURAL.

The doctrine of purgatory, like many other inventions which Popery has incorporated with Christian truth, was derived from heathenism. Long before the Christian era philosophers dreamt and poets sang of a middle state, where souls underwent a process of purification to fit them for admission to a state of happiness. Plato speaks of the dead under three classes and three states corresponding to their character. The truly good were admitted to the Elysian fields, regions of tranquillity and enjoyment; the bad or incurably wicked were

doomed to Tartarus, or hell; and another class, neither so holy as to be fit for the Elysium, nor so totally corrupt as to be doomed for ever to the gloomy regions of Pluto, were destined to suffer for a while, and then to be transported to the regions of happiness. Take one example of heathen purgatory from Virgil (Æneid 6), translated by Dryden:—

> 'For this are various penances enjoin'd;
> And some are hung to bleach upon the wind,
> Some plunged in waters, others purged in fires,
> Till all the dregs are drain'd, and all the rust expires.
> All have their Manes, and those Manes bear:
> The few, so cleansed, to these abodes repair,
> And breathe, in ample fields, the soft Elysian air.
> There are they happy; when by length of time
> The scurf is worn away of each committed crime,
> No speck is left of their habitual stains;
> But the pure ether of the soul remains.'

Thus the notion of purgatory can boast of an antiquity far higher than the Roman Church; but it was a notion of heathenism, and from thence, like many other superstitions, it was gradually introduced into the Church. In the early ages of Christianity we find no traces of the doctrine there; but when pagan philosophers, attracted by the majesty, benignity, and purity of the Christian system, embraced it, they brought with them various heathen notions, and this among the rest. Yet its prevalence was slow and fluctuating. It was received by some and rejected by others, and at times was almost lost sight of, until Pope Gregory adopted it and gave it the sanction of his official authority; and afterwards it was established as an article of faith by the Council of Florence in the fifteenth century.

The concessions of Roman Catholic writers are important on this subject. John Fisher, the Bishop of Rochester, in his eighteenth article against Luther, says, 'He that pleases, let him read the commentaries of the old Greeks, and, as I suppose, he shall find none, or very rare mention of purgatory; but neither did the Latins at one time, but by little and little, conceive the truth of this thing.' Polydore Virgil, another Romanist writer, remarks, 'As it regards the origin of this matter, as far as I can ascertain, after inquiry, I do not find it before St Gregory presented it in his stations.' It is worthy of notice, too, that Gregory himself seems not to have held the doctrine at one time, but afterwards he embraced it, and wrote

in his Dialogues sentiments which are contradicted in his Annotations. In order to give the dogma a general reception, stories of visions, dreams, and miracles, the most preposterous and disgusting—the most degrading to the intellect of man, and the most revolting to Christianity—were fabricated and published. Thus it originated with fiction, was nurtured by superstition, and matured by hypocrisy, and extortion.

SECTION I.—CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL DISPROVED.

To give the dogma of purgatory some colour and plausibility, a few obscure texts of Scripture and ambiguous phrases from some ancient symbols of the Christian faith are tortured into its service. Thus the passage in Ps. xvi. 10, and the phrases which speak of Christ's descent into hell, contained in the so-called Apostles' and the Athanasian Creeds, are quoted as sanctioning the doctrine of purgatory. Dr Milner asserts, that purgatory is evidently the place mentioned in the Apostles' Creed—'He descended into hell.' We shall now inquire what authority this doctrine has, either in the Apostles' Creed, or in the passage on which that clause in the creed is supposed to be founded. We observe,

1. *This creed is only of human authority.* True, it bears the name of 'The Apostles' Creed;' it is honoured with this title in the 'Book of Common Prayer.' This designation intimates that the Apostles themselves were the authors of the formula; and that thus emanating from apostolic authority, it has been handed down from their times to our own. Now this is either true or false. If true, it invests the creed with inspired authority, and every part of it is as binding on our conscience as any portion of the sacred volume.

But if it be an historical fact that this creed never was framed by the Apostles, but compiled at different periods since apostolic times, and by different men, who had no claim to inspiration, its title is a deceptive misnomer, and a grave offence against truth and religion. What, then, is the fact? Every one conversant with Church history knows that this formula, as it now stands, had no existence in apostolic times, but is the production of different ages. Most of its doctrines are undoubtedly Divine, and some of its phraseology bears a high

antiquity, bordering even upon apostolic times; but there is no evidence that any creed, consisting of an exact and uniform set of phrases, was in use in apostolic days; and there is abundant evidence that a considerable part of this formula is the offspring of later ages. We have before us the creeds of Ignatius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, and Gregory Neocæsarea,* which are the only ones extant of those which were known within the *first three centuries* of the Christian era; and yet they are all different from one another, and are all different from the one which was afterwards compiled and called the 'Apostles' Creed;' for, indeed, this creed, as a distinct formula, had no existence during that period. Some of its doctrines were expressed in those creeds already named, yet with diversified phraseology. The evidence is decisive that the Apostles never wrote the creed, and the title it bears is spurious.

2. Whilst the title of the creed is false, and the formula itself of mere human authority, that clause which speaks of Christ's descent into hell is one of the latest additions which were made to this confession of faith. There are, indeed, two clauses which had no place in any of the confessions of faith existing up to the fourth century; those clauses are the communion of saints, and the descent into hell. When we enter the fourth century of the Christian era, we find many confessions of faith, but in not one of them is any mention made of the descent of Christ into hell, until we come towards the middle or close of that century. Thus, in that important document, the 'Nicene Creed' (A.D. 325), adopted by the English Established Church, and used in her liturgy, there is no allusion to Christ's descent into hell. True, there is this clause in the Athanasian Creed, but this was written afterwards. Bishop Pearson, as much distinguished by candour as by varied and extensive erudition, has thoroughly investigated the antiquity and authority of the Apostles' Creed; and as the result of his elaborate researches, he not only admits that the clause relating to Christ's descent into hell has no place in the creeds we have already named, but further states 'it is not contained in those

* Ignat., Epist. ad Tralles. p. 52; Amsterdam, 1646. Irenæus, lib. i, c. 2, p. 35, 36, et lib. iii. c. 4, p. 172; Genev., 1580. Tertullian, de Præscrip. advers. Hæret., p. 73, et de Virg. Veland, p. 385; Paris, 1580. Origen, Com. in Johan., tom. 32, p. 397, vol. 2; Rothomagi, 1668. Cyprian, Epist. lxxvi. § 6, p. 248; folio, 1593. Gregor. Neocæsar. Dr Cave in his 'Apostolici,' p. 127.

creeds which were made by the Councils of Ephesus or Chalcedon; not in those confessions made at Sardica, Antioch, Seleucia, Sirmium, &c. It is not mentioned in several confessions of faith delivered by particular persons: not in that of Eusebius Cæsariensis, presented to the Council of Nice; * not in that of Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, delivered to Pope Julius; † not in that of Arius and Euozius, presented to Constantine; not in that of Acacius, Bishop of Cæsarea, delivered in to the synod of Seleucia; not in that of Eustathius, Theophilus, and Silvanus, sent to Liberius.‡ There is no mention of it in the creeds of St Basil, Gelasius, Damasus, Macarius. It is not in the creeds expounded by St Cyril, by St Augustin, by Maximus Taurinensis; nor in that so often interpreted by Petrus Chrysologus; nor in that of the Church of Antioch,§ delivered by Cassianus; neither is it to be seen in the manuscript creeds set forth by the learned Archbishop of Armagh. Indeed, it is affirmed by Ruffinus, that in his time it was neither in the Roman nor the Oriental creeds.‖ It is certain, therefore (nor can we disprove it by any acknowledged evidence of antiquity), that the article of the descent into hell was not in the Roman or any of the Oriental creeds.' He further observes, 'The first place we find it used in was in the Church of Aquileia; and the time we are sure it was used in the creed of that Church was less than four hundred years after Christ."¶ Such is the candid acknowledgment of the learned prelate, and his concession is the more valuable, as it is that of a divine whose Church has adopted the creed in her liturgy, and whose writings have so copiously expounded and illustrated that document.

Thus it is clearly proved that the title of the creed is spurious, that the creed itself is of mere human origin, and that the article respecting the descent into hell was not found in any confession of faith until late in the fourth century. The attempt, therefore, to put forth this clause to the world as of inspired authority is a dishonour to the Christian Church and the cause of truth.

* Theodoret, Hist. Eccles., lib. i. cap. 12.

† S. Epiph. Hæres., lxxii. § 10.

‡ Socrat. Hist. Eccles., lib. i. cap. 26; lib. ii. cap. 40; lib. iv. cap. 12. Tract de fide in Asceticis.

§ De Incarn., lib. vi. ‖ Ruffin. in Symb.

¶ Pearson on the Creed, p. 353.

3. Not only is the creed a human compilation, and the clause respecting Christ's descent into hell one of the latest innovations, but the meaning of that clause has ever been uncertain and diversified. Popery claims it as a proof of purgatory; but as a mere human production it can be a proof of nothing except the opinion held by its authors, and what this opinion was it is now difficult to determine. The clause can be no proof that the Apostles held the doctrine of purgatory, for they were not the authors of the clause. Nor can this clause be a proof that the Papal doctrine of purgatory was held at all during the first three centuries; for the clause was not inserted in the creed until towards the close of the *fourth* century. If we even admit that the clause does refer to purgatory, the fact that those words formed no part of any creed whatever until the close of the *fourth* century is presumptive evidence, at least, that the doctrine was not held till then; and if not held till then, it is necessarily an innovation, a human invention, a corruption of Christianity, and not an element of the Gospel of Christ and his Apostles.

But we are not prepared to admit that the clause was originally intended to express the doctrine of purgatory. Facts, we think, prove the contrary. We have already stated that this remarkable clause was first introduced into the Aquileian Creed; but what purpose did it serve there? Two facts argue that it was intended to express, *not* the doctrine of purgatory, but the mere fact that Christ's body was laid in the grave, and that he entered into the state of the dead. First, in the Aquileian Creed, there were not the *two* clauses we have in the creed now: one expressing that Christ was buried, and another that he descended into hell. The clause that he was buried was left out of that creed; but the clause expressing the descent into hell was inserted in its stead. Thus, then, the matter stood. Formerly the creeds expressed Christ's burial merely, without any allusion to a descent into hell; but the first time we find the phrase respecting *Christ's descent into hell* mentioned in the creed, we find the *burial* is omitted. The descent, therefore, stood in the place of the burial, and appears to have meant the same thing. Bishop Pearson remarks, 'It appeareth, therefore, that the first intention of putting these words into the creed was only to express the burial of our

Saviour, or the descent of his body into the grave.' Another fact corroborative of this view is, that the words themselves used in the Aquileian Creed did not literally express either purgatory, or the hell of the damned, or any region in the spiritual world. The words were, *He descended to the lower parts*,* agreeably with what the Apostle says, in Eph. iv. 9, 'He descended first into the lower parts of the earth;'† that is, he was laid in the grave, from which he arose by the power of his Godhead.

That other meanings were *afterwards* attached to these words in the creed we admit, and that many vague notions were held by the ancients we also admit; but those notions were mere human opinions, which, of course, have no authority. Some thought that Christ descended into the hell of the damned, and that he delivered many of them from their torments; some believed that he went there and delivered *all* the damned from their misery, and took them to heaven; and others, regarding hell as meaning the common receptacle for human souls, maintained that all the righteous who had died before Christ were in an inferior place and state of happiness, and that he went to these after his death and raised them to a superior world of glory, to reign with him at the right hand of God. These and other conflicting views, the dictates of fancy or speculation, were entertained and advocated. But it was long after the period when the article of the descent into hell first made its appearance in the creed, that the doctrine of purgatory was established in the Church. Certain vague and heathenish notions on this subject were gradually introduced, and about the close of the sixth century Pope Gregory gave the doctrine his countenance and support, when it rapidly gained adherents, and at last became confirmed by the Council of Florence in the year 1439. So far, then, as the testimony of the creed goes, it is against the doctrine of purgatory, and proves it to be an innovation upon the faith once delivered to the saints.

It now devolves upon us to examine the passage in Ps. xvi. 10, upon which, it is alleged, the clause in the creed is founded

* *Descendit in*, or *ad*, *inferna*.

† Κατέβη πρῶτον εἰς τα χατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς. The Latin word *infern* itself is derived from the Greek word Ερα, the earth or ground, the place wher the dead body is laid.

'For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.' That this passage refers to Christ, and has received its accomplishment in him, is attested by inspired authority. Peter, quoting the text, expressly applies it to our Lord:—'For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.'—Acts ii. 25—27. But how this text can be a proof of purgatory we are at a loss to conceive. Purgatory is said to be a middle state, where the souls of men who have departed this life in venial sin make satisfaction by suffering certain pains, and in time become purified and fitted for translation to heaven. But this passage speaks of 'hell.' There is nothing said either about a middle state or a middle place. Purgatory is not so much as named, nor is there anything implied which answers to that place. There is nothing said about venial sins or mortal sins, nothing about human souls being purified or making satisfaction by penal suffering. Besides, the Romanists do not pretend that purgatory is for Christ, but for mankind; yet here the only being spoken of is Christ. It will not be contended that his soul needed purgation; nor is there any reason assigned in the text, nor can any reason be deduced from it, why Christ should go to any middle state or place called purgatory. It is most unfortunate for the Papistical doctrine, that its advocates should seek to prove it from a text which says nothing about it.

It is admitted as a general rule in Biblical criticism, that the meaning of a passage is not to be summarily decided by a detached sentence, but is to be gathered from the context, which unfolds the scope and design of the writer. If, then, the doctrine of purgatory be intended, we shall undoubtedly find some intimation of it in the context; but, from the beginning of the psalm to the end, not a syllable respecting the distinction between venial sins and mortal sins, nor about souls being purified by penal suffering, nor a middle state or place of existence. And we can only say, that he who is capable of finding the smallest allusion to such a doctrine in this psalm, must be

endowed with the extraordinary faculty of seeing that which is invisible, and of finding that which has no existence.

The passage before us is quoted and applied by Peter and by Paul, and the use they make of it will guide us in its interpretation. Let us, then, carefully attend to the Apostles' words; and, to obviate the charge of unfairness or partiality we shall quote from the Roman Catholic version. Peter, addressing the Jews, says, 'Ye men, brethren, let me freely speak to you of the Patriarch David; that he died and was buried and his sepulchre is with us to this present day. Whereas therefore he was a prophet, and knew that God had sworn to him with an oath, that of the fruit of his loins one should sit upon his throne; foreseeing this, he spoke of the resurrection of Christ. For neither was he left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up again, whereof we are all witnesses.'—Acts ii. 29—32. By the Apostle Paul, also, the passage is quoted in part, and applied in the following address to the Jews:—'And we declare unto you that the promise which was made to our fathers, this same God hath fulfilled to our children, raising up Jesus, as in the second Psalm also it is written: Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. And to show that he raised him up from the dead, not to return now any more to corruption, he said thus: I will give you the holy things of David faithful. And therefore in another place also he saith: Thou shalt not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption. For David, when he had served in his generation according to the will of God, slept; and was laid unto his fathers and saw corruption. But he whom God hath raised up from the dead saw no corruption.'—Acts xiii. 32—37.* Here, then, we have two Apostles quoting the passage, expatiating upon it, and showing its application and fulfilment; but not one word is said, by either Peter or Paul, about a middle state, or purgatorial fires, or venial sins, or souls visited by Christ in limbo, or rescued from suffering by his descent. On all subjects connected with a state or place corresponding to purgatory there is a perfect silence. The only application the Apostles make of the passage in question is to prove that it referred not to David, but to the resurrection of Christ, and was fulfilled by that glorious event. From the

* Rhemish version, Dublin, 1837, published by authority.

evidence before us, then, it is conclusive that neither the text itself, nor the context, nor the parallel passages in which the text is quoted, expounded, and applied, contain any reference to purgatory.

Before we present our own explanation of the peculiar phraseology employed by the Psalmist, it may be proper to notice the several interpretations which have been given by others.

1. Some have imagined that the prophecy means that Christ should go literally into hell, and there suffer for a time the pains of the damned, in order to complete his atonement for sin. As the curse of sin extends to the future world, exposing man's soul to the wrath of God in hell, the advocates of this opinion suppose that, in order to our Lord's being a perfect substitute, a vicarious victim for sinners, it was necessary that he should place himself in the sinner's state in hell, and suffer for him there as well as upon earth. This view was held by Calvin and others. To this erroneous opinion we reply—The worth and satisfaction of Christ's atonement are not to be estimated merely by the degree of his sufferings or their duration, but as combined with the dignity and glory of his person; and he being infinitely glorious, the merit of his atoning work on earth is infinite, and there was no need for his sufferings in the future world. Besides, the notion is unscriptural. There is no part of the sacred volume which represents that Christ should suffer in the future world for sinners; on the contrary, the salvation of mankind is always ascribed to his passion and death on the cross. We are said to be 'justified by his blood,' and 'reconciled to God by the death of his Son.' Moreover, the same Scriptures affirm that the work of atonement was completed by his death on the cross.—Heb. ix. 25—28; x. 12, 14. When the Saviour was expiring on the cross, he exclaimed, '*It is finished*,' and bowed his head and gave up the ghost. At that moment the atonement was completed, and his sufferings were ended.

2. Others have contended that Christ literally descended into hell, yet not to suffer there the pains of the damned, but to satisfy the law of death. This is the view held by Bishop Pearson in his work on the creed. He says, that 'as Christ appeared on earth in the similitude of sinful flesh, he went into

the other world in the similitude of a sinner, and his soul went to hell, in order to satisfy the law of death.' This opinion is not so revolting as the former, but we strongly object to it as inconsistent and unscriptural. It could not be necessary for Christ to enter hell that he might satisfy the law of death, for that law he had already satisfied by submitting to death. Nor did our Lord enter the other world, as the bishop states, 'as a sinner.' He died as a 'sin-offering,' but not as a sinner. He entered eternity as the beloved Son of God, who was well pleased with him for his righteousness' sake, and his perfect atonement on the cross. When dying, he commended his departing spirit into the hands of his loving Father; and to the expiring thief he said, 'This day shalt thou be with me (not in hell, but) in paradise.' It is remarkable, that throughout the whole argument the good bishop never mentions the passage just quoted from the dying words of our Lord. The fact that Christ went directly to paradise on the very day of his crucifixion sets aside all the bishop's reasoning about the Saviour's going to hell to satisfy the law of death.

3. Another view held by some divines is, that our Lord descended into hell to take possession of the infernal dominions and there to triumph over Satan and his angels. This is the view advocated by Richard Watson, and is founded partly upon the Psalmist's words in Ps. xvi. 10, and upon those passages in Eph. iv. 8, and Col. ii. 15, where the Apostle speaks of Christ spoiling principalities and powers, making a show of them openly triumphing over them, leading captivity captive, &c. These representations, he thinks, imply a *personal* descent to the regions of the damned, and a public exhibition of personal triumph.

With all due deference to this able divine, we differ from his interpretation. We think the language in Ps. xvi. 10—'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell'—does not comport with his being there in triumph. It seems to be rather expressive either of a state of suffering, or at least of some disadvantageous state, from which he desired to be delivered; and he rejoices in the assurance that he should be delivered therefrom—'*Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell.*' Then, as to his taking possession of hell as a part of his dominion, it was not necessary that the Redeemer's soul should descend to that locality for such a pur-

pose, for already his spiritual presence filled immensity. Christ is said to fill all things as Mediatorial Governor, and all worlds are put under his dominion, but we never suppose that this mediatorial dominion renders it necessary for his human soul to go to every part of the universe. Besides, it does not appear that Satan and all his angels were locally in hell at the time. Satan and myriads of his angels were on earth during the Redeemer's sufferings. Satan entered Judas and tempted the Redeemer in Gethsemane, and legions of those fallen spirits were going to and fro on the earth and walking up and down therein; so that to triumph over them personally and locally did not require the soul of the Redeemer to enter the regions of hell. Moreover, the time of the Saviour's triumph over the powers of darkness had not arrived before his resurrection. Death was an enemy he had yet to vanquish; and as Satan is said to have had the power over death, he could not as yet be vanquished. To triumph over these Christ's resurrection was essential. How, then, could he lead captivity captive, when as yet his body was a prisoner in the tomb? How could he spoil principalities and powers, and make a show of them openly, when as yet he himself was under the dominion of death and the grave? The grand event which was to declare him conqueror and proclaim the perfection of his triumph was yet wanting. When the resurrection took place there was a glorious triumph; it was then manifest to earth, to heaven, and hell, that his atonement was accepted, and his power as the conqueror and destroyer of hell was proclaimed. Hell knew this and felt it, and saw in the risen Redeemer that all was lost, and their defeat completed. And when the Redeemer ascended on high he led captivity captive; his own body, once dead, was now alive and glorified, and death, hell, principalities, and powers were spoiled and trampled in the dust.

4. Others regard the word *hell* as meaning the state or place in which spirits exist while disembodied, and suppose that the prophecy means that God would not leave the Redeemer's soul in that state or place, but soon re-unite it with the body, and then exalt both soul and body to heaven. This is the interpretation of Baxter, Doddridge, Henry, and many others. In support of this view it is alleged that the Hebrew word *sheol* (hell), in its most comprehensive sense, includes the whole

spiritual world, the invisible region of all departed souls, in one part of which are the righteous and in the other the wicked. It must be acknowledged that the Hebrew word *sheol*, and the Greek *hades*, rendered by our word *hell*, have this large and general meaning, and that such a meaning was formerly included in our own word *hell*, which is derived from the Saxon word *hil*, to cover, to hide or put out of sight. Thus *sheol*, *hades*, and *hell*, in their largest and most comprehensive sense, include the whole of the unseen world—the common receptacle of departed souls, where they are hidden from our view; and it is true that the soul of the Redeemer after death entered the spiritual world.

But the interpretation founded on this criticism does not, in our judgment, express the true meaning of the passage in question; for the word *sheol* is never used when the place of blessedness is *specially* intended. In its customary sense, it means either the *grave* or the hell of *perdition;* and it is only applied to the spiritual world in a large and general sense, when there is no special reference to a place or state of happiness. But the soul of Christ, on departing from the body, entered into *paradise.* This is expressly stated by our Lord himself; and though the words *sheol*, *hades*, and *hell* do, in their largest sense, comprehend the unseen world in general, or the region which was supposed to be the common receptacle of departed souls, yet those terms are never employed in Scripture to denote the particular region of the blessed. *Hell* is a term which neither in our own language nor in the original tongues is ever used in the Scripture to mean paradise or heaven. Besides, the words 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell' imply, we think, a suffering condition, or some particular state from which the Redeemer desired to be delivered, and therefore those words cannot apply to the soul of Christ when in the separate state or in paradise. Substitute the word 'paradise' for 'hell' in the passage, and the erroneous nature of this interpretation will at once appear; for the text will then read, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in paradise,' or in a state of blessedness! We shall hereafter show that this and other discordant and inconsistent renderings of the passage have arisen from an erroneous translation.

5. Another interpretation is, that the word *hell*, as used in

this passage, is not to be applied either to the hell of perdition, or to any region in the spiritual world, but to the *grave*. This interpretation is sanctioned by divines of great antiquity. We have already seen that when the clause respecting Christ's descent into hell was first introduced into the creed by the Church of Aquileia, in the fourth century, it appears to have been understood of his burial. This view seems to have been entertained also by the Reformers of the English Church; for, in the homily on the resurrection of Christ it is said, 'He passed through death and hell to the intent to put us in good hope that by his strength we shall do the same.' The same view is maintained by Munster, Vatablus, Grotius, Beza, and many more modern commentators and divines. It must be acknowledged that the original word *sheol* has this signification, and is thus extensively used in the Scriptures. There is this serious difficulty, however, in supposing that the prophecy could speak of the Redeemer's soul not being left in the grave: it never entered there, but went direct to paradise immediately on the death of the body. Yet there are several modes in which men have attempted to solve this difficulty. Some have supposed that though the passage speaks of the *soul* of Christ, yet only his dead body is intended. Thus Beza renders the word נַפְשִׁי (*nepheshi*) 'my corpse,' instead of 'my soul:' 'Thou wilt not leave *my corpse* in the grave.' And Grotius renders it *myself;* as if the text said, 'Thou wilt not leave *myself* in the grave.'

We object to both these interpretations, on the ground that the passage clearly refers to the two-fold nature of Christ, his body and his soul, and makes mention of the two states which respectively apply to each. *Sheol* is evidently mentioned with respect to the soul of Christ, and *corruption* is mentioned with respect to his body; and, therefore, any interpretation which ignores this distinction in the two parts of Christ's nature cannot be correct. Some suppose that by the term *soul* only the *animal life* of Christ is meant, and that the passage simply declares that his *life* should not be left in the grave, but raised again. If we admit that the word *nephesh* frequently means *life* in other parts of Scripture, yet we cannot admit that to be its meaning here; for it is exceedingly improbable that this sublime prophecy should speak of the body and animal life of the Saviour, and omit any reference to the superior part of

his nature—the soul. Others, pressed by these difficulties, admit that the *soul* of Christ is meant, but think that the phraseology is employed in accordance with a popular notion that the soul of man descends with the body into the sepulchre. We object to this view as unscriptural. Whatever erroneous notions, respecting the human soul descending with the body to the grave, might obtain among heathens and the ignorant part of the Hebrew nation, certainly no such notion could be incorporated in an important prophecy of Christ's resurrection; nor can any interpretation based upon such a supposition be in accordance with truth.

There is scarcely any portion of the Sacred Scripture which has been so diversely interpreted, and respecting which such a variety of conjectures have been volunteered to harmonize it with sound doctrine and other parts of Scripture. This fact itself is suggestive that the true meaning of the passage has been generally misapprehended, and the misapprehension has, we conceive, arisen from an inaccurate translation. That inaccuracy, in our opinion, consists in the adoption of the preposition IN instead of the preposition TO or FOR—an error which in numerous instances might transpire without at all impairing the general sense of a passage, but which in this instance gives quite a different complexion and meaning to the prophecy, and has been a fruitful source of difficulty and embarrassment.

As the passage is translated in our own version and in many others, it conveys a sense which implies that the soul of our blessed Lord should, after the death of the body, enter into a state or place of suffering expressed by the Hebrew word *sheol*, from which it should soon be delivered; whereas the passage, when properly rendered, means that the soul of our Lord should not enter there at all. The *erroneous* sense we have just adverted to lies so obviously upon the surface of the passage, as it stands in our version, that it is made the foundation of Bishop Pearson's entire argument. He says, 'Now, from this place (Ps. xvi. 8—10) the article (in the creed) is clearly and infallibly deduced thus: If the soul of Christ were not left in hell at his resurrection, then his soul was in hell before his resurrection: but it was not there before his death; therefore upon or after his death, and before his resurrection, the soul of

Christ descended into hell.' * This reasoning is clearly founded upon the supposition that the passage implies that the soul of Christ should, after his death, enter into the place or state called *sheol*, and the same view has misled other interpreters. We believe the passage, when properly rendered, implies no such thing, but just the reverse; namely, that that the soul of Christ *should not enter into the place called* '*sheol*,' whatever place that word may designate.

The reader may reasonably inquire, Will the original bear the construction you propose to put upon the passage? We reply, It is the most natural, simple, and grammatical construction which the text can receive. Every tyro in Hebrew knows that the two prepositions *in* and *to* are commonly expressed in Hebrew by single letters prefixed to the words they govern. Thus ב (*beth*) prefixed to the name of a place means *in* that place, and ל (*lamed*) prefixed to a name means *to* or *for* the object or place intended by the noun. We give one or two examples of these Hebrew prepositions. In the following instances, the preposition ב (*beth*) is used, and it will be seen that its proper meaning is, as we have stated, *in*. 'O that thou wouldest hide me *in* the grave.'—Job xiv. 13. 'For *in* death there is no remembrance of thee: *in* the grave who shall give thee thanks?'—Ps. vi. 5. 'There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, *in* the grave, whither thou goest.'—Eccles. ix. 10. We now take an example of the other Hebrew preposition ל (*lamed*), which properly means *to* or *for* the object intended. In the Psalm before us, we have instances of the use of *both* these prepositions, and we give them that the reader may see at one view the difference between them. 'Preserve me, O God: for *in* thee do I put my trust. O my soul, thou hast said *to* the Lord, Thou art my Lord; my goodness extendeth not to thee; but *to* the saints that are *in* the earth, and the excellent, *in* whom is all my delight.'—Ps. xvi. 1—3. In every case before us, where the word *in* is put in italics, the preposition ב (*beth*) is used in the original; and in every instance where *to* is put in italics, the preposition ל (*lamed*) is used in the original. We now turn to the text under consideration and ask, What is the preposition used before the word *sheol?* We see the translation of it is *in*, as 'Thou wilt not

* Pearson on the Creed, p. 360, octavo. London, 1830.

leave my soul *in* hell,' or *sheol*. Now, had the preposition ב (*beth*) been used, the word *in* would have been its proper translation; but instead of that the preposition ל (*lamed*) is used, and the word *to* should, most certainly, have been used in the translation. Therefore the literal and proper rendering of the passage is, 'Thou wilt not leave (or abandon) my soul to hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.' Thus, instead of conveying a sense which implies that the Redeemer's soul should go to *sheol*, or hell, for a time, on the contrary, it predicts the fact that his soul should not be left, or abandoned, to go to that place at all. This corresponds exactly with another passage, where the Psalmist says, 'God will redeem my soul from the power of *sheol:* for he shall receive me.'—Ps. xlix. 15.

The translation we have given of this passage is supported by two of the oldest versions in existence—the Chaldee paraphrase and the Septuagint. In the former the same preposition is used as in the Hebrew, and has precisely the same meaning, *to* or *for;* and in the latter that preposition is employed which the most exactly corresponds with this meaning. It is well known that in the Greek language the words which correspond with the Hebrew prepositions are εν (*en*) and εις (*eis*), the former meaning *in,* and properly representing ב (*beth*), and the latter meaning *to,* and expressing the meaning of ל (*lamed*). Now in the translation of the passage by the Septuagint, εις (*eis*) is used, and not εν (*en*), thus exactly agreeing with the translation we have given. It is worthy of notice, too, that when the Apostle Peter quoted this Psalm in Acts ii. 27, he employed the preposition εις (*eis*), which properly expresses the sense we have given to the Hebrew word in our interpretation. It does not invalidate our argument to admit that these prepositions, both in Hebrew and Greek, are sometimes interchangeable, and are occasionally substituted the one for the other. We have to do with the true and proper meaning of the preposition, and the true and proper meaning is that which we have given in our interpretation; and though the particles may sometimes be used almost indifferently, there are many cases where they cannot be interchanged one for another, and the passage in question is one of those instances. The proper meaning of the particle ל (*lamed*) is *to* or *for,* and such is its

meaning in the text we are examining; and to give it the meaning of ב (*beth*) or *in* is to obscure the passage, perplex the reader, and sanction error. The literal rendering we have given to the passage removes the obscurity, and presents a plain, intelligible sense.

While this interpretation agrees with the most ancient versions, it harmonizes with the several subjects named in the passage, and helps to bring out their natural and obvious meaning. The passage evidently speaks of the twofold nature of Christ; his *soul* is expressly mentioned, and his bodily frame is also referred to; for corruption is spoken of, and it is only a material substance that can be liable to corruption. We take the soul to mean literally the spiritual nature of Christ, that vital and immortal essence which survived the body. The passage speaks also of two states, as applying to the two parts of human nature—corruption, as pertaining to the body, and *sheol*, or hell, as applying to the soul; but into neither of those states was Christ to enter; for it is said, 'Thou wilt not abandon my soul to hell,' to be consigned to that abode of misery; 'neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.' The soul shall suffer, but thou wilt not abandon it to hell; and the body shall die, and be laid in the grave, but thou wilt not consign it to putrefaction.

This interpretation agrees also with the context and general scope and design of the prophecy. The Psalm contains one of the most remarkable predictions of the Old Testament in reference to Christ's passion, death, resurrection, and ascension to glory. The prophecy, too, is expressed in the first person. Christ himself is the speaker, and he speaks of the things concerning himself. Ages before his incarnation, he contemplates the work he would have to perform, and the sufferings he would have to endure. The scene is one of mingled terror and glory. He knows that his sufferings from men, from devils, and from the requirements of Divine justice, will be awful; but he is assured of the Divine favour and support; and this assurance inspires joy, even in the prospect of his agony. Hence he exclaims, 'I have set the Lord always before me: because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved.' I shall not be moved from my purpose, nor fail in its execution. The Saviour knew, too, that his sufferings would

be vicarious; that he would have to suffer as a substitute for sinners; that he must take the place of the guilty criminal; and that, in atoning for him, he must experience an awful degree of agony in his soul, and finally die on the cross as a sacrificial victim. The prospect is awful, but he knows that his anguish will be but temporary. Though his soul must agonize under the pressure of human guilt in this world, it shall not be doomed to the sinner's hell in the next; and though his body must die and be laid in the tomb, yet it shall not, like the bodies of sinners, be doomed to putrefaction, but shall rise again on the third day. Animated by these assurances, his joy increases, and he further exclaims, 'Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not abandon my soul to hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.'

This interpretation of the prophecy is further sustained and illustrated by the facts which fulfilled the prediction. The Redeemer did suffer both in body and in soul, and both body and soul were delivered and glorified, as the Psalm foretold. The Redeemer suffered in his body from the buffeting, the scourging, and cruel treatment of the Roman soldiers; from the crown of thorns, the burden of his cross, and the lingering yet racking pains of crucifixion; and, finally, his body died and was laid in the gloomy sepulchre. But unspeakably more awful were the pains and anguish of his soul. The soul of the blessed Redeemer endured a hell of suffering in the work of human salvation. It pleased the Father to bruise him: he put him to grief, and his soul was made an offering for sin. In the garden of Gethsemane, the powers of hell were let loose upon him, and the burden of human guilt crushed him to the earth. 'His soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death;' and 'being in agony, he sweat as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.' Never was sorrow like unto his sorrow. It was beyond the agony of a soul in hell. The sorrows of death compassed him, and the pains of hell gat hold upon him: he found trouble and sorrow. All this was necessary in effecting our redemption; but his sufferings were temporary. They were not protracted beyond his death. His soul

was not abandoned to hell. Though he suffered for the sinner in this world, he was not consigned to the sinner's hell in the next. This was not necessary, for his sufferings on earth were sufficient to make a full atonement for all mankind. While he hung on the cross, his mental anguish was brought to an end; and, conscious that his spirit would have an immediate entrance into happiness, he said to the dying thief, 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise;' and when expiring, he exclaimed, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'

As his soul was not abandoned to hell, so neither did his flesh see corruption. The mortality of his body was, indeed, continued longer than the agony of his soul; but this also was temporary. His flesh rested in hope. On the third day he arose from the dead, and thence his reign of commingled triumph and glory begins. Afterwards he ascended on high, led captivity captive, and took his seat at the right hand of God, where there is fulness of joy and pleasures for evermore. Thus the passage of the Psalmist affords no sanction to the figment of purgatory, or to the notion of a local descent into hell; but receives its accomplishment in the termination which God gave to the Saviour's mental agony on the cross, and the resurrection of his body from the tomb, and the glorification of both soul and body at the right hand of God. An interpretation which is thus supported by the literal phraseology and grammatical construction of the passage, which is sustained by the most ancient versions, which agrees with the scope and meaning of the context, and which is verified by the facts of the Redeemer's sufferings and resurrection, is, we believe, the true interpretation of this interesting portion of Sacred Scripture.

SECTION II.—CHRIST'S PREACHING TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON.

'By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing.'—1 PETER iii. 19, 20.

THIS passage is confessedly the stronghold of Papists in their defence of the doctrine of purgatory. It must, however, be a matter of embarrassment with them that a doctrine to which they attach so much importance should have such slender

support from Scripture, that they are obliged to have recourse to a few of the most obscure and difficult passages in the sacred volume. This is not the case with evangelical truth. It is clear and obvious. It stands out in bold and prominent relief, forcing itself upon our attention, and commanding our assent. If I were a Romanist, I should certainly feel much perplexity and misgiving respecting the doctrine, if to find even a slender support of it, I must leave the plain and obvious parts of Scripture, and have recourse to the difficult and obscure. I should feel this embarrassment increased if, as a Romanist, I found that some eminent teachers in my own Church either doubt, or deny, that the doctrine of purgatory can be fairly deduced from this passage. Yet such is the fact. St Jerome applies the passage to the *present* life; for he says 'that Christ preached to the spirits in prison, when the patience of God waited in the days of Noah, bringing the flood upon the wicked.' * St Augustine suggests respecting this passage, that 'the whole of St Peter's statement concerning the spirits in prison, who believed not in the days of Noah, may have no reference whatever to the spiritual world, but rather to those times of which he has transferred the example to our own. For before Christ came once in the flesh to die for us, he came often in the Spirit to those whom he would, giving them by visions such spiritual intimations as he wished; by which he was also quickened.' † Thomas Aquinas agrees with this interpretation.‡ The venerable Bede thus explains it, in the following forcible language:—'He who in our times, coming in the flesh, preached the way of life to the world, preached also before the flood by his Spirit to those who were then unbelieving and carnally-minded. For he was by his Holy Spirit

* 'Prædicavit spiritibus in carcere constitutis, quando Dei patientia exspectabatur in diebus Noe, diluvium impiis inferens.'—Hieron., lib. xv. Comment. in Isa., cap. 54, tom. iii. col. 395. Paris, 1704.

† 'Considera tamen ne forte totum illud, quod de conclusis in carcere spiritibus, qui in diebus Noe non crediderant, Petrus Apostolus dicit, omnino ad inferos non pertineat, sed ad illa potius tempora, quorum formam ad hæc tempora transtulit. . . . Quoniam priusquam veniret in carne pro nobis moriturus, quod semel fecit, sæpe antea veniebat in Spiritu ad quos volebat, visis eos admonens sicut volebat utique in Spiritu; quo Spiritu et vivificatus est.'—Augustin. Epist. clxiv. *ad Evodium*, c. vi. sec. 18, tom. ii. col. 578. G. 580, c.

‡ T. Aquin., Summ. Theol., pars iii. quest. 53, art. 11, p. 145. Lyons, 1567.

n Noah, and in the other holy men who lived at that time, nd by their good conversation preached to the wicked nen of that age, that they might be converted to better hings.' * The learned Calmet also gives the same interpreta- ion of this passage. He observes, 'Christ preached by his Spirit, with which he filled Noah, to the unbelievers of that ime. He preached, therefore, to those unbelievers, not in erson, or visibly, but by his Spirit communicated to Noah.' † These quotations are from weighty authorities in the Church of Rome. If the sentiments of such men as Jerome, Augustine, Bede, and Calmet are against the Papal interpretation of this, he strongest passage that can be adduced in favour of purga- ory, the doctrine may well be regarded as resting on an un- ound foundation.

But let us ourselves enter upon an examination of this pas- age. Those who suppose it to favour the dogma of purgatory magine that the '*prison*' spoken of is some invisible region alled purgatory; that '*the spirits*' who are said to have been *disobedient*' are the *souls* of the antediluvians, who perished n the flood, and were sent to the prison of purgatory; and hat to these Christ went and preached in the interval between is death and resurrection. We think, however, a little ex- mination will show that it has no more to do with purgatory nan it has with the planet Jupiter and his inhabitants, even n the principles which Romanists themselves maintain.

1. The text speaks only of certain individuals who were *dis- bedient in the days of Noah*, and who perished in the universal eluge. Now, if there be a purgatory, it is, of course, not a lace for the reception of those only who perished in the eluge, but for individuals in all ages of the world; for those ho died before the flood, and for those who died after the ood; for those who died in the patriarchal age, in the Levitical

* 'Qui nostris temporibus in carne veniens iter vitæ mundo prædicavit, ipse am ante diluvium eis, qui tunc increduli erant et carnaliter vivebant, Spiritu niens prædicavit. Ipse enim per Spiritum Sanctum erat in Noe, cæterisque i tunc fuere sanctis; et per eorum bonam conversationem, pravis illius ævi minibus, ut ad meliora converterentur, prædicavit.'—Beda in Pet. iii. 19, n. v. col. 980. Basil, 1563.

† 'Christ, par son Esprit, dont il remplit Noë, prêcha aux hommes incré- les de ce tems-là. Christ prêcha, donc, à les incrédules, non en personne ni iblement, mais son Esprit, qu'il avait communiqué a Noë.'—Calmet; Com- nt. iv. 24, 159.

age, in the prophetical age, and in the Christian age. Now, had the Apostle been speaking of Christ's preaching to souls in purgatory, he would doubtless have spoken of his preaching to *all* departed souls who were in purgatory; but instead of this, he confines his remarks to certain men who lived in the time of Noah. He speaks of Christ preaching, not to all, but only to those individuals who lived at one particular period, and perished in one particular judgment. No other are mentioned; no other are referred to; to no other is the slightest allusion made in the passage. The question, then, necessarily arises, If purgatory be a receptacle for certain characters in *every* age, and if all such are undergoing a process of purification to fit them for final deliverance, why did Christ preach to some only? Why are all the rest passed by without being once mentioned? How is it that Christ did not preach to any others? and why does the Apostle notice no others? There is but one consistent answer. St Peter was not alluding to purgatory at all!

2. The characters spoken of were unsuitable for purgatory, even on the Romanists' own statements. Hell is a place of eternal punishment for the wicked; heaven is a place of rest and joy for the perfectly holy; but purgatory is said to be a middle place of purification for the righteous, who, though the children of God, are not sufficiently pure for heaven, and who are sent to purgatory to be fully purified. Let us hear the Romanists themselves expound this doctrine. We refer to none but the highest authorities. Dens, in his 'Theology,' thus speaks of purgatory: 'It is a place in which the *souls of the pious dead*, obnoxious to temporal punishment, suffer enough or make satisfaction.'* In the Catechism of the Council of Trent it is declared, 'In the fire of purgatory *the souls of just men* are cleansed by a temporal punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country, into which nothing that defileth entereth.'†

In 'The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine contained in the Profession of Faith,' published by Pope Pius IV., by way of question and answer, we have the following:—

* 'Quid est purgatorium? *R.* Est locus, in quo animæ justorum defunctorum obnoxiæ pœnis temporalibus satis patiuntur.'—Dens, Theolog., tom. 7 tract. de Quatuor Novissimis de Purgatorio, No. 25.

† Catechism of the Council of Trent, p. 59.

'*Q.* What do you mean by purgatory?

'*A.* A middle state of souls, which depart this life *in God's grace*, yet not without some lesser stains or guilt of punishment, which retard them from entering heaven.'

The Douay Catechism is published by high authority, and is a recognized exponent of the Papal doctrine. Respecting purgatory and the future world, the following tenets are taught:—

'*Q.* Whither go such as die in mortal sin?

'*A.* To hell, to all eternity.

'*Q.* Whither go such as die in *venial* sin, or not having satisfied fully for the punishment due to their mortal sins?

'*A.* To purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven.'

Now the distinction between 'mortal sin' and 'venial sin' is thus given by Bishop Hay:—'What is mortal sin? Mortal sin is a grievous transgression of the law.—What is venial sin? It is a smaller transgression of the law—a more pardonable offence.'

Here let it be well observed by the reader that those admitted to purgatory are described as those only who are designated '*the souls of the pious dead*,' '*the souls of just men*,' '*the souls which depart this life in God's grace*,' '*such as die in venial sin;*' while those who die in mortal sin go to hell to all eternity. These are their own words. Hence it follows that the individuals who perished in the deluge could not be admitted into purgatory, for they died in mortal sin. They were neither saints, nor the souls of the pious dead, nor persons who died merely under venial sins. Indeed, they were the most abandoned and notoriously wicked beings who in any age have offended God and polluted the earth. Behold the loathsome portraiture of their character—'And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. . . . And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth.'—Gen.

vi. 5, 6, 12, 13. We ask, in the name of common sense, whether these persons are to be numbered with 'the pious dead?' If these men were merely *imperfect saints*, where, we ask, shall we look for sinners?

To this enormous and universal guilt we must add the sin of incorrigibility. They continued hardened to the last moment. Jehovah warned them of the coming judgment; he sent his servants to preach repentance and reformation; he strove with them by the powerful agency of his Spirit, and he waited for them during the protracted period of one hundred and twenty years, while the ark was preparing. But they heeded not his threatened judgment, they accepted not his offered mercy. When they saw the ark finished, they were still impenitent; when the venerable patriarch entered the appointed refuge, they laughed at his folly; when they beheld the animals spontaneously follow him, their stubborn hearts still yielded not, but to the last moment they continued in the attitude of defiance, living in pleasure, riot, and excess, as if all religion were a lie, and the world were destined to last for ever, when the deluge burst upon them, and swept them all away in a tempest of indignation. The rich man in the Gospel is described as lifting up his eyes, *not* in purgatory, but in *hell*, being tormented with the flames of the awful pit; yet, so far as we know, he led a harmless life compared with antediluvian sinners. The slothful servant, who did not squander his talent in licentiousness, but merely neglected to improve it, is condemned and cast into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth; but the men whose lives were wholly corrupt, and whose hearts were the repository of evil only, and evil continually, are favoured by Popery with a place in purgatory! Thus Popery contradicts alike herself and the Word of God.

3. Our Lord, after his death, did not go to a purgatorial prison, but to the paradise of God. The Papist construes the words of the text, 'By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison,' to mean that our Lord went to purgatory. This notion, however, is exploded by what we have already advanced; for if the characters we have noticed were not such as were adapted for purgatory, it follows that they did not go to purgatory; and if the persons to whom Christ

Christ preached were not in any purgatorial prison, then the text does not teach that Christ went to purgatory at all.

Such is the logical deduction from our previous arguments, but we have also direct evidence from the plain and obvious declarations of Scripture. The Gospel informs us that the soul of Christ, on leaving the body, went immediately, not to the prison of purgatory, but to paradise. The dying Saviour said to the expiring penitent who hung by his side on the cross, 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' Again, just at the moment of his departure, he said, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.' We ask, Do these phrases comport with purgatory? Is the hand of his loving Father synonymous with the prison of purgatory? or is paradise identical with the doleful regions of limbo? It surely requires both the credulity and the perverted mind of a Romanist to receive such a conclusion. But the Holy Ghost has decided what paradise is. It is not the prison of purgatory, but the third heaven, the seat of the blessed, a region of glory and blessedness. 'I knew a man in Christ,' says an apostle, '(whether in the body or out of the body I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven. . . . How that he was caught up into *paradise*, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.'—2 Cor. xii. 2, 4. Now, in the language of Scripture, the first heaven is the atmosphere around us, in which the fowls of the air fly, and where the clouds are suspended; the second heaven is the region beyond, where the sun, moon, and stars revolve; and the third heaven is a place of glory and joy. That paradise and the third heaven are only different names for the same happy place, is further obvious from Rev. ii. 7, where the reward of the righteous is expressed by admission to the enjoyments of the paradise of God: 'To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.' And again: 'Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.'—Rev. xxii. 14. If, then, the paradise of God be identical with the third heaven, it is evident that paradise cannot be synonymous with purgatory; and if Christ on the day of his crucifixion entered paradise, it is fatal to the figment of his going to preach to imprisoned souls in purgatory.

The preceding arguments prove two things. 1. That the disobedient persons who perished in the deluge never entered into any purgatory; 2. That neither did the Saviour enter into any such place. And hence it follows that the passage does not speak of such a place as purgatory, or of any individuals who had entered there.

It will now be demanded, What is the interpretation of the passage? We believe that the persons who are designated 'spirits in prison' were those individuals who lived in the days of Noah, and remained impenitent; that the preaching of Christ by the Spirit to them was the ministry exercised in the person of righteous Noah. That the persons referred to were the antediluvian sinners who perished in the deluge appears clear from the Apostle's direct statement that they 'were disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing.' That Christ preached to these individuals is expressly asserted, and is, therefore, no matter of controversy. But when did he preach to them, and how? That he did not preach to them in purgatory has been proved, for it has been shown that they never were in any purgatory. That they were preached to either in hell or heaven is not contended for even by our opponents. If, then, they were preached to by Christ, and yet that preaching did not occur either in heaven or hell, or in any supposed purgatorial state, it follows that it did not occur at all in the spiritual world, and must necessarily have transpired in the *present* world, and during their existence in the time of Noah. This is in strict accordance with the text, for it asserts that the individuals in question were disobedient 'in the days of Noah, while the long-suffering of God waited for their repentance.' Since the Apostle mentions, in the same breath, both their being preached to and their disobedience, is it not evident that both the privilege and their neglect of it were coincident in time and place? Is it not forced and unnatural to suppose him speaking of their disobedience as occurring at one period in the *present* world, and their privileges, ages after, in the spiritual world, in a fancied region called purgatory? To us the supposition seems simply ridiculous. Disobedience implies neglect, resistance, and obstinacy. If they were 'disobedient,' they *must* necessarily have disobeyed something. What could they

disobey except the commands, calls, and invitations of Almighty God? And how could these calls, invitations, and commands be addressed to them except by vocal proclamation, and by public announcements of a Divine message uttered by the living voice—the mode by which God in all ages has called men to repentance and obedience. If God *waited* their repentance, he must have *called* them to repentance; if he exercised *long-suffering*, it implies that he long bore with their resistance to the Divine *message;* and this aspect of the Divine conduct towards them involves the employment of preaching, and of every suitable means for their repentance and salvation. Hence we argue from the text itself, that the preaching of Christ and the disobedience of the people were coincident and contemporaneous facts; both took place 'in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing.'

Here the question may be pressed, How could Christ preach to them, seeing he was not then incarnate? We reply, He preached to them, as the text itself states, 'by the Spirit;' and, as other Scriptures tell us, through the instrumentality of Noah. Let us look at the passage and its connection with the preceding verse, and we shall see, at least in one sense, how Christ preached to the antediluvians. The Apostle, speaking of Christ's death, says, 'He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.' That is to say, it was the Holy Spirit which raised him again. Then the Apostle immediately adds, 'By which also'*—that is, *by which Divine Spirit*—'he preached,' &c. So, then, the Apostle does not tell us that Christ went in his human nature, or in person, and preached unto the individuals in question, but that he did this by the Spirit. Thus the passage explains itself.

The view thus naturally deduced from the passage itself is elsewhere taught in Scripture narrative; for sacred history informs us that God's Spirit did powerfully operate upon the antediluvian race, and its operations are expressed by the peculiar phrase, 'striving with man.' 'And Jehovah said, My Spirit shall not always STRIVE with man.'—Gen. vi. 3. This language indicates some special and extraordinary operations of the Divine Spirit upon the hearts of ungodly men. But besides

* Εν ῳ̣ καὶ. Here we have the relative pronoun *which*, and the antecedent the word πνευματι, which immediately precedes it.

this influence of the Holy Spirit, there was the personal ministry of Noah. This just and holy man is emphatically designated 'a preacher of righteousness' (2 Peter ii. 5); and when we consider the office he sustained, and the solemn revelation made to him of the coming deluge, we may easily imagine what would be the substance of his public appeals to a guilty world.

We are aware it will be asked, In what sense can it be said that Christ preached, when the act itself was performed by Noah? We reply, Noah preached by the direct authority of Christ, and under the influence of Christ's Spirit. Noah was an ambassador for God, and the official acts of an ambassador are accounted as the acts of the sovereign from whom he receives his commission. Thus the apostles said, 'Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.' If, then, the apostles spoke in Christ's stead, so did Noah, for he preached by the same authority; if in the ministry of the apostles it was proper to regard the Gospel as a message from Christ to mankind, so it was in the ministry of Noah; and hence the propriety of our interpretation of the passage—Christ preached to the antediluvians through the ministry of Noah.

It was the Spirit of Christ, then, which the antediluvians resisted, and the ministry of Christ which they disobeyed and rejected. Nor is there anything peculiar in the interpretation of this portion of the sacred writings. The same principle applies to other passages both in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. Indeed, so constantly was the agency of Christ exerted under the old dispensation, that the influences commonly ascribed to God may in general and with equal propriety be ascribed to the Son. The murmuring and rebellion of the Israelites in the wilderness are spoken of by St Paul as rebellion against Christ—'Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.'—1 Cor x. 9. The general inspiration of the prophets is ascribed to the Spirit of Christ, as the Apostle Peter states when he informs us that 'the prophets who prophesied of the grace that should come, inquired and searched diligently what, or what manner of time the SPIRIT OF CHRIST which was in them did signify when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the

glory that should follow.' Noah himself was a prophet as well as a preacher of righteousness; and if it was the *Spirit of Christ* which inspired other prophets, and spoke by them to mankind, it must have done the same by Noah, for he was one of them; and if the rebellious Israelites are said to have 'tempted Christ' by their sins, so the antediluvians may be charged with resistance to his ministration of mercy.

But the text states that 'Christ went and preached' to the individuals in question; and this phraseology, it is thought by some, seems to indicate Christ's *personal* ministry —an actual and personal going to them. We reply, the very same phraseology is used by the Apostle Paul respecting Christ, in a case where his *personal* ministry was never exercised. We refer to Eph. ii. 17; but to show the connection of the words, we give also the preceding verse. 'And that he might reconcile both (Jews and Gentiles) unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: AND CAME AND PREACHED PEACE to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.' Now, here it is said that Christ, after his death on the cross, *came and preached peace* to the Ephesian Gentiles; but, we ask, did he do so in person? So far from going to preach to the Ephesians, he expressly declared that his mission did not extend to the Gentiles at all. 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' If, then, Christ in person never went and preached peace to the Ephesian Gentiles, in what sense can the Apostle mean that he went and preached peace unto them? There is but one sense in which this can be interpreted: he did it through the ministry of his apostles. He was their sovereign Lord; they were his ambassadors; and acting under his authority, and preaching in his name, and blest by his abiding presence and influence, their official acts were virtually his own. Thus, then, the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers again supports our interpretation. The phraseology used by St Paul is substantially the same as that used by St Peter; and as in the former case it refers not to Christ's *personal* ministry, but to that of his apostles, so in the latter case it refers not to his *personal* ministry, but to that exercised by his ambassador in the preaching of the venerable patriarch Noah.

It may be inquired, What are we to understand by the

phrase, 'the spirits in prison'? We reply, the phrase is capable of a twofold sense, either of which is perfectly consistent with the general interpretation we have given of the controverted passage. Dr Macknight thus paraphrases the passage:—'By which Spirit also speaking in Noah (2 Peter ii. 5) he preached to the persons *now* (spirits) in prison, who formerly were disobedient when the patience of God, once for all, waited for their reformation in the days of Noah.' We see no objection to this view; but there is another sense equally consistent. The term '*spirits*' may be synonymous with *persons*, as the word '*souls*' is often employed both in the Old and New Testament without having any reference to the disembodied state. Thus the word '*souls*' is used in the next verse. Peter, speaking of the ark in which some were saved, says: 'Wherein few, that is, eight SOULS were saved.' If, then, the word 'souls' means *persons*, without reference to their disembodied state, why may not the word 'spirits' have the same meaning? Indeed, in several other passages the word '*spirit*' seems to be applied to persons still in the body: 'The spirits of just men made perfect,' and God 'the Father of spirits.'—Heb. xii. 9, 23. See also Numb. xvi. 22, and xxvii. 16. Viewed in this sense, the prison in which these persons were held was the prison of their sins, holding them in the chains of unbelief, guilt, and condemnation. This is a frequent metaphor of the state of degenerate men, and one with which all are familiar. David prays, 'Bring my soul out of prison, that I may praise thy name;' and the object of the Saviour's ministry was, 'to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that were bound.' The spirits of the antediluvians were bound in the prison of sin, and the object of Noah's preaching was to deliver them; but they rejected the Divine message, and continued in unbelief and disobedience. Thus the grammar, logic, and theology of the passage lead to a conclusion opposed to the doctrine of purgatory.

SECTION III.—THE TRIAL BY FIRE.

'For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.'—1 Cor. iii. 11—15.

This remarkable passage is one of those which Popery has pressed into its service in support of the doctrine of Purgatory. Cardinal Bellarmine, the famous expounder and advocate of Papal doctrine, says, that this passage 'is one of the most obscure, yet one of the most useful in the whole Scriptures.'* If the Cardinal mean that 'obscurity' is better adapted than light to the sordid purposes of deception and extortion, we can understand him; but if he mean that 'obscurity' is more favourable to truth and holiness, we must dissent from his opinion; for the love of truth is the love of light; and that the diffusion of light is promotive of virtue and religion, both revelation and reason declare. Other Romish divines, however, concur with Bellarmine as to the obscurity of the passage. Alexander says, 'It is a most obscure passage, the sense of which it is scarcely possible to ascertain.' † Augustine remarks, 'This sentence of St Paul is very difficult to understand.' ‡ And Faber, another Romish writer, observes, 'This authority is certainly very obscure; and various explanations are offered, not only from different Fathers and Doctors, but even from the same Doctor. Augustine interprets this passage in various ways.' § We do not concur with these men as to the obscurity of the passage. Its meaning is sufficiently plain to an intelligent mind, not prepossessed with some favourite theory. The alleged obscurity is not in the passage itself, but in the minds of Papal doctors, whose efforts to wrest the Apostle's meaning to favour their own creed both obscure the truth of God and involve themselves in endless absurdities. But if the passage be obscure, as they represent it to be, where, then, is their consistency in pressing it into their service? A portion

* Bellarm., lib. 1, cap. v. tom. 2, p. 393. D. Coloniæ, 1683.
† Alexand. Nat., lib. 9, p. 378. Paris, 1683.
‡ Augusti nde Octo. Dulcit. Quæst., sec. vi. tom. 6, col. cxxiv. 6. Paris, 1685.
§ Faber, lib. 2, p. 444. Paris, 1720.

of Scripture so extremely difficult to understand cannot certainly be of much avail to establish a fundamental doctrine; and the great eagerness displayed to force and torture it into Papal service, is a tacit admission of the dearth of Scripture evidence for the dogma of Purgatory.

The Church of Rome boasts of her unity of sentiment and infallibility, but it is really pitiable to see the perplexity and bewilderment of Romish divines in their attempts to interpret this scripture. Scarcely any two of them agree in their explanation; often, indeed, they contradict and refute each other's opinions; and sometimes the same writer betrays the doubts and misgivings of his own mind, by denying at one period what he has affirmed at another. 'Bellarmine, Alexander, and Calmet have collected a copious specimen of the jarring interpretations of saints, expositors, and divines on this part of the inspired volume, and their collections afford no flattering view of the unity of Romanism.'* Mr Hall has given a condensed and faithful representation of the conflicting views of Papal authorities. 'Origen, Ambrose, Jerome, and St Augustine, in expressing their views on this passage, maintain, with the Apostle, that the "*foundation*" *is Christ;* but Clement of Alexandria says *it is faith and hope in Christ;* and Chrysostom and Theophylact say *it is a true but a weak faith.* Tertullian, Ambrose, Jerome, and after them Anselm, and Aquinas, agree that *the builders are doctors and preachers;* while Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact refer the term to *all Christians.* Clement of Alexandria, Ambrose, and Jerome declare that the gold, silver, and precious stones signify *Catholic interpretations;* and that the wood, hay, and stubble signify *heresies.* Augustine says that the wood, hay, and stubble signify *our attachment to the things of this life.* Theophylact and Chrysostom affirm that they are *mortal sins;* and that the gold, silver, and precious stones *represent good works.* Origen, Jerome, Augustine, together with Bernard and Bede, regard the fire as the emblem of *temporal tribulation before death;* Lactantius, Basil, and Ambrose apply it to the *general conflagration at the day of judgment;* while Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact affirm it to be *hell itself.* Bellarmine, Ward, and Challoner, however, contend that it signifies *purgatory,*

* Edgar's 'Variations of Popery.'

while Alexander confesses that the passage *is totally inadequate to sustain the doctrine of a purgatorial fire.*' * Here we have, without doubt, abundance of smoke, confusion, and contradiction. Yet such are the bewildering and conflicting elements which constitute the only basis of the infallible decrees of Rome, and which we are commanded to swallow wholesale, or be consigned to eternal damnation.

That the passage neither teaches the doctrine of purgatory nor affords any sanction to that notion, may be shown from its palpable opposition to the authorized teaching of the Church of Rome respecting the nature and design of purgatory. The Church of Rome teaches that the design of the fire of purgatory is to purge, to purify, to make such satisfaction by penal suffering as will render the soul entitled to heaven; but the fire mentioned in the text says nothing about purifying, or purging, or making satisfaction to Divine justice, but, on the contrary, it is a fire which consumes and destroys. Wood, hay, and stubble are not purified by fire, but utterly destroyed. They perish in the flame. Here, then, is the first contradiction to the Papal doctrine of purgatory.

Take another instance. The Church of Rome teaches that *all* the souls sent to purgatory are ultimately saved. She admits that those who are sent to hell perish for ever—their case is utterly hopeless; but *all* who are sent to purgatory will be finally delivered and raised to heaven. The sufferings inflicted on some souls, she tells us, may be extended to hundreds or thousands of years, yet, without doubt, they will at last be purified and saved. But St Paul, in the passage before us, speaks of a fire in which only a part will be saved, while the rest will be destroyed by it for ever. The gold, silver, and precious stones will abide in the fiery trial; but the wood, hay, and stubble will be burned—will hopelessly perish. Here, then, is a second contradiction to the Papal dogma of purgatory.

Take another instance. The Church of Rome teaches that souls are now in the fires of purgatory, and that the duration of punishment in purgatory, and the period of deliverance, are not the same for all, but are exceedingly diversified. Many

* Vide 'Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of Praying for the Dead, Examined,' pp. 49—56.

souls, they tell us, are delivered already; others will soon be delivered by the aid of masses and prayers of the faithful, and, in fact, that cases of deliverance are continually occurring. But the Apostle speaks not of any fire as operating now, nor of different periods when men shall pass through this fire. On the contrary, he speaks only of one event and of one period—one grand and general trial by fire, at one special period; and that period he designates emphatically '*the day*.' His language is, 'Every man's work shall be made manifest, for *the day* shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire.' Thus, the Apostle's teaching and that of Popery are totally at variance again. The period mentioned by the Apostle is *future*, it is to come hereafter; but the period of purgatory is *now*, and has been for many past ages. The Apostle speaks of one grand event, when the state of all souls, good and bad, shall be decided simultaneously in one solemn day; but in the Papal purgatory some are punished for a longer period, and some for a shorter period; some are purged in one age, and some in another. The period of decision mentioned by the Apostle is one, but those of Popery are numerous, and differ by intervals of thousands of years. Now, it is evident that the only day of simultaneous and universal decision as to the eternal destiny of men will be, as all admit, the day of judgment. But the day of judgment and the period of purgatorial punishment cannot be the same, even on the Romanists' own showing; for, when the eternal destiny of all men is fixed, both a state of probation and of purgatory will be at an end. Indeed, Cardinal Bellarmine expressly says, *purgatory will be evacuated and left empty on that day.* It is thus manifest that the day mentioned by the Apostle cannot be made to synchronize with the period of purgatory; and here we have a third contradiction between this passage and the Papal dogma.

Take another instance. The Church of Rome teaches that part of her members do not go to purgatory at all, but that some of her saints go direct to heaven. But the Apostle, on the contrary, expressly speaks of a fire to which *all*, without exception, shall be exposed—a fire through which *all* must pass—the gold, the silver, and the precious stones, as well as the wood, hay, and stubble. Here, then, is a fourth contradiction between the Apostle and the Papal dogma.

It is obvious that the language of the passage is highly metaphorical; yet the metaphors are not new or strange, but such as are elsewhere frequently employed in Scripture. This fact dissipates all obscurity, and gives facility and certainty to the interpretation. The visible Church of God is here set forth under the image of a building: Christ is the foundation; apostles, evangelists, and ministers are the builders; and professing Christians constitute the materials of the fabric. The whole Church shall be subject to a searching ordeal at the day of judgment; the Word of God is the fire which shall test every character; true believers shall abide the searching ordeal, but hypocrites and false professors shall be burned, and each minister shall receive a reward according to his fidelity and usefulness—the less faithful and successful suffering loss, but the more diligent and useful being the more highly honoured and rewarded in that solemn day. Let us now see how this interpretation is sustained by collateral passages and the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers.

The foundation of this building is Christ. This is expressly stated in the text. 'Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ.' The same imagery is elsewhere employed in the sacred record. Thus the Lord declares by the prophet Isaiah, 'Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation.'—Isa. xxviii. 16. And Christ, applying the same metaphor to himself, says, 'the stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner.'—Matt. xxi. 42.

The builders are Apostles, Evangelists, and all Ministers. This is also expressly stated. St Paul, speaking of himself and Gospel ministers in general, says, 'We are labourers together with God.' Then, addressing Christians in general, he says, 'Ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building. According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon.'—1 Cor. iii. 9, 10.

The materials composing the edifice are professing Christians. Some, indeed, have thought that *doctrines* constitute the materials of the building; but the incorrectness of this view is manifest from these two facts. First, doctrines are not set forth in

Scripture as the *work* of man; they are not of human origin or device, but of God; and secondly, in Holy Scripture, doctrines are not compared to a building, but the members of the visible Church are frequently thus represented. In the context Paul, addressing the Corinthians personally, says, 'Ye are God's building.' Addressing the Ephesians, the same Apostle applies to them personally the same metaphor. 'Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.'—Eph. ii. 19—22. The Apostle Peter also applies the same imagery to *persons* and not to doctrines. Addressing the members of the Church of God scattered through divers regions, he calls them the stones which build up the spiritual house of God. 'Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house.'—1 Peter ii. 5. The same expressive imagery was used in the Old Testament. In Isaiah, God, foretelling the enlargement, purity, and prosperity of his Church, says, 'O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted, behold, I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones. And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children. In righteousness shalt thou be established.' The individuals, therefore, whom ministers gather out of the world and incorporate with the visible Church, constitute the materials of the building. They are 'God's building.' They are 'the temple of God.'

The diversity there is in the quality of the materials of the building represents the diversity of character in those who compose the visible Church of God. Some of these materials are valuable and ornamental: 'gold, silver, and precious stones,' which represent sterling Christians, genuine believers, useful and holy members. They shine 'in the beauty of holiness' —the comeliness which God puts upon his people; they are living stones 'polished after the similitude of a palace,' and their

haracter adorns and beautifies the temple of God, imparting o it a heavenly and Divine lustre. These are God's 'jewels,' is peculiar people, and are precious in his sight. Yet as gold s more valuable than silver, and as some jewels are more pre- ious than either, so there are different degrees of excellence mong real Christians. Some are more eminently holy and seful than others, and reflect greater honour on the Church f God. But some of the materials used in this metaphor are erishable and worthless in a building—'wood, hay, and stubble;' nd these denote hypocrites, formalists, and worthless profess- rs. Such characters impart no real value to the Church, nor ontribute to its solidity and usefulness. On the contrary, hey deface its beauty, impair its strength, and endanger its tability. They are the chaff among the wheat, as rotten ranches of the vine, and as thorns and briars which infest the arden of the Lord: and their end is to be burned.

Every part of the fabric is to undergo a fiery ordeal. This hall take place at a certain period in futurity called '*the day*' —namely, the day of judgment. It is sometimes called 'the ay of the Lord,' 'the last day,' 'the day of his coming,' 'the dgment of the great day,' 'the day of God;' and here, by way f emphasis, it is 'the day.' The instrument employed in this earching trial is represented as '*the fire*.' No material fire referred to as the grand instrument of this trial on the day f judgment. The phraseology of the passage implies that the ord 'fire' is used metaphorically; for in speaking of the nar- w escape of that minister whose work is destroyed, the postle says, 'But he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire' —not literally by fire, but *so as by fire*—language which ex- udes a literal meaning, and denotes comparison and metaphor. et us, then, drop the figure for a moment, and ask, What is that shall on the day of judgment be the grand test of men's aracter? What shall, in fact, constitute the ordeal to which l men shall be subject on that solemn day? The answer of ripture is 'The word of God.' This is the rule of our life w, and this is the standard by which all men must be judged the last day. But is the word of God in other parts of ripture set forth by the image of fire? Let the Scripture ain answer for itself. 'Is not my word like as a fire? saith e Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?'

—Jer. xxiii. 29. 'Wherefore thus saith the Lord God of Hosts, I will make my words in thy mouth fire, and this people wood, and it shall devour them.'—Jer. v. 14. The fire, then, that will try every soul of man on the day of judgment will be the fire of God's holy, searching, and inflexible word. By this they will be justified, and by this will they be condemned.

In this trial there will be a true manifestation of character, and all will receive their eternal destiny according to its issues. Some materials will stand the fiery ordeal; gold, silver, and precious stones will 'abide' the searching test; other materials are but fuel for the flame—wood, hay, and stubble will be 'burned.' The application of this is obvious to every one. The truly righteous, the sincere and holy, will be found approved of God and numbered among his jewels. Judged by the faithful word, their characters will stand forth in all their sterling excellence, purity, and usefulness. In the presence of an assembled world, the Judge will acknowledge them for his, vindicate their motives, roll away for ever the reproach which an ungrateful and malignant world had cast upon them, bring forth their judgment as the light, and their righteousness as the noon-day, place them at his right hand, and welcome them to the eternal joys and glories of his heavenly kingdom. 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, enter into the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' On the other hand, the hypocrite, the formalist, and the unsound professor, will be detected, exposed, and punished in that day. 'For, behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts.' The fire of God's holy word trieth the hearts of men, as gold and silver are tried in the furnace. It is as severely penetrating and searching into character as fire is to any substance exposed to its action; so that on that day nothing but sterling piety will stand the test of the sacred book, opened before him that sitteth on the great white throne. In this world the form may be assumed for the power; talents, and station, and influence may win good opinions from men, and a painted exterior deceive the very elect; but in the day of judgment the searching scrutiny will expose every deceiver, and show him forth in his naked deformity and hypocrisy. As

ire not only tries and searches any substance exposed to its action, but inflicts the most dreadful pain upon sensitive beings, so the word of God by its holy requirements and principles not only convicts the sinner and reveals his deformity, but condemns his character, and denounces against him the most awful threatenings of wrath and indignation. This fire shall not, indeed, consume or destroy his existence, as material fire destroys wood, hay, and stubble, but it shall act upon his conscience as an inexorable tormentor, inflicting inconceivable agony and pain, world without end.

In this trial ministers of the Gospel will be subject to the same searching and impartial scrutiny as other men, and be rewarded according to their works. 'Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.' The building up of the Church is more especially the work of Gospel ministers, and the final character of their work will greatly affect their own reward. The minister whose faithfulness and diligent labours have instrumentally built up the Church with sterling characters—holy, devoted, and useful members—shall in the day of judgment receive an special reward. Besides the reward assigned to him as a real Christian, he shall receive the reward promised to the faithful steward. 'For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming? For ye are our glory and joy.' 'They that be wise (or teachers) shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever.'

On the other hand, the minister who, though on the whole a good man, yet has been so far deficient in faithfulness and zeal that he has allowed the Church under his care to be composed of unsound materials—formalists and worldly-minded professors, whose end is to be burned—'he shall suffer loss.' He shall have the mortification and dishonour of seeing his work disapproved and rejected at the last day, and the souls of men once under his care perish in his presence. Awful event!

and so far as it results from any want of diligence or fidelity on his part, he will suffer loss—a loss of that honour and happiness which are to be awarded to the more faithful and successful minister of Jesus Christ.

'But he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' That is to say, if he have, on the whole, been a good man. If he have built upon the true foundation, and continued in a state of grace, he shall be saved. He shall be saved as an ordinary Christian, though not rewarded as a minister. The case is one which may be supposed, and is, we fear, a type of such as actually exist in our own day. Though such ministers may be saved, even amidst the awful wreck and destruction of their work, yet it shall be '*so as by fire.*' Some interpret this to mean with extreme difficulty, just as if a man should escape from the flames of his dwelling, though his family perish in the blaze. That this is true in fact, there can be no doubt; for the minister whose work is burned as worthless must be in the utmost danger of being burned himself: yet this, we think, is not the meaning of the clause before us. The Apostle means simply that he shall be saved just in the same way as others; that is to say, that though a minister, he shall not be saved on account of his official station and privileges. No favour shall be shown him because of his position in the Church, but, like all the rest, he must be tried by the fire; and if he stand the searching ordeal of God's word he shall be saved, but not otherwise.

Thus the entire passage affords no sanction to the Papal notion of purgatory. On the contrary, it contradicts and disproves that doctrine at every step. In the clear but awful light which it sheds on man's character and destiny, we see that no Papal masses can rescue a soul from suffering, no benefactions to the Church can purchase for it a place in heaven, no prayers offered after death can change its destiny or character. Every one, ministers as well as people—all are to be tried at the last day by the fire of God's truth, and their eternal doom to be fixed according to their character here. The corrupt and the unholy must perish, and the Christian alone, the truly regenerate alone, can be saved.

SECTION IV.—PASSAGES ERRONEOUSLY QUOTED IN SUPPORT OF PURGATORY.

'Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; est at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee o the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by o means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.'—MATT. v. 5, 26.

ANOTHER passage adduced by Romanists to support the doc- rine of purgatory is the one above quoted. The prison men- ioned in this passage is supposed to mean purgatory, and the aying of the last farthing is said to imply the doctrine of satis- action by penal suffering in purgatory. It is, however, very nfortunate for this notion that it is opposed by high authorities mong the Fathers, and even by some Papal writers of eminence. t Jerome interprets the 'prison' as hell; for he says, 'He is ever released from prison who does not pay the last farthing efore the end of life.' * St Chrysostom applies the phrase to outer darkness,' where men suffer Divine vengeance, and here there is no longer time for repentance. He says, 'Agree ith thine adversary whilst thou art in the way with him, that s, in this life; for when the way is finished there is no longer ime for repentance. Beware lest the adversary deliver thee o the judge, and the judge to the avenging powers, and thou e cast into prison, that is, into outer darkness; being con- emned, not only for thy deeds, but even for thy thoughts. et us implore the all-merciful God, that we be not delivered p to the devils.' † Augustine delivers the following exhorta- ion: 'Induced, therefore, by these salutary reflections, be- oved brethren, let us agree with our adversary while we are in he way with him: that is, let us conform to the word of God hile yet we are in this life; for afterwards, when we shall have eparted hence, there will be neither room for contrition nor atisfaction. Nothing will then remain except the judge, the fficer, and the prison.' ‡ Now this language, like that of Chry- ostom, cannot apply to purgatory, but to eternal perdition. The ame writer again remarks, when speaking of the parable of

* Hieron. Comment. in Marc. iii. tom. v. p. 895. Paris, 1706.
† Chrysostom, Hom. xxvii. de Pœnitentia, tom. i. p. 824, B.C.—Ed. aris, 1636. See also Hom. xvi. in Matt. v. 25, 26, tom. i. p. 204, &c.
‡ Augustin., Hom. v. in 1 Tim. iv., tom. x. col. 420. D. Basil, 1569.

the rich man and Lazarus, 'With reference to his (Abraham's) declaration, that the good cannot, even if they wished, pass over to those places in which the wicked are punished, what else does it mean except that no merciful assistance can be rendered by the just, even if they wished to render it, to those who, by the immutability of the Divine sentence, are so fast in prison that they cannot go out thence until they have paid the uttermost farthing?'* Fulgentius likewise applies the phraseology to hell, and that in the most unequivocal language. He observes, 'A man makes the word of God his adversary when he does those things which Holy Writ forbids. To such a one it is said in the Psalm, "*Thou hatest to be reformed, and hast cast my words behind thee.*" If any one in the way, that is, in this life, agree not quickly with this Divine word, he is thrown into the prison of eternal fire, and will have no rest beyond it.'† Bede, remarking on this passage, gives it the following interpretation: '*Until* thou payest' is put for infinity, just as, in another place, 'Until I place thine enemies beneath thy footstool.'‡ Maldonatus expressly applies it to hell, the place of everlasting torment. He says, 'The way is the time of this life, the prison is hell. He will never come out, because those who are in hell never pay.'§ Alexander is equally clear and decided in applying this scripture to everlasting punishment:—'It does not mean that we shall come out afterwards, but that we shall never come out; because when the condemned suffer infinite punishments for mortal sins, they never thoroughly discharge them. Those of whom this is said will never come out of the prison of hell.'‖

We have introduced these comments, not because we regard them as being strictly correct, but to confront Papal doctors in their attempt to force the passage to speak in favour of purgatory. All the authorities adduced are clearly against the Papal use of this scripture, and we might add to the number. Leaving the contradictory authorities between the Fathers and the Romish Church, we have now to inquire what is the true meaning of the passage.

* Augustin., Quæstionum Evangeliorum, lib. 2, sec. iii. col. 265, tom. iii Paris, 1689.

† Fulgentii Rusensis Episcopi de Remissione Peccatorum, lib. 2, cap. v. p 387. Paris, 1684.

‡ Beda, lib. 5, p. 12. Coloniæ, 1612.

§ Maldonat., Comment., p. 121. Mentz, 1596.

‖ Alexand., Histor., lib. 9, p. 385. Paris, 1683.

There is nothing in the literal phraseology of the passage which expresses the slightest allusion to the spiritual world, or the future condition of souls. If we look at the context, we find that our Lord is inculcating the duty of meekness and gentleness of spirit—of peace and brotherly affection, without which our devotions are unacceptable, and our professions of religion vain. He says, 'Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.' Then comes the text under consideration, and it is a further application of the same principle—that of meekness and placability. 'Agree with thine adversary quickly,' &c.; that is to say, Be not contentious, resentful, or litigious; but be gentle and placable. Live peaceably with all men. Seek peace and pursue it; and if a controversy or misunderstanding should exist between thee and any person, and lead thine antagonist to prosecute thee at law, take the first opportunity of composing the difference by making all reasonable concessions. Do this quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him; that is, by mutual agreement, before you appear together at a legal tribunal; lest the judge decide against thee, and stern justice take its course—the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, until thou hast paid the uttermost farthing. Having neglected the opportunity of mutual arrangement by timely concession, the unrelenting law will exact from thee all its rigorous demands.

That this is the true meaning of the passage is evident from the version which Luke gives of the Saviour's words in a parallel text:—'When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the very last mite.'—Luke xii. 58, 59. We have here the same precept in substance as that recorded by Matthew, and it gives us the true meaning of our Lord. Indeed, being given by inspired authority, it must be regarded as exegetical or explanatory of the former, as is usual with other

parallel passages of the sacred volume. Hence we are compelled to give the precept of our Lord a literal sense. This literal application of the passage has force and propriety, from the fact that the litigious disposition and frequent disputes of the Jews at that time rendered such counsel especially necessary.

But if even we give the passage a *figurative* application, it can avail nothing in favour of purgatory, for several important reasons. *First*, It is against all acknowledged laws of sound criticism and Scriptural interpretation to employ a metaphor in proof of any controverted doctrine. *Secondly*, The fanciful application of the several terms in this passage, to make it subserve the purposes of Popery, would render it perfectly ridiculous; for if the word 'prison' be applied by the Papist to purgatory, and the payment of the last farthing to penal satisfaction, then, to be consistent, all the other terms must have a corresponding application. Thus, the debtor or the culprit must be man, the plaintiff must be God, and the ruler before whom both go for justice must be Christ; and, while God is dragging the sinner to Christ the ruler, the sinner must propose terms of accommodation, and seek to make peace. If he do not adopt this course, Christ the ruler will deliver him over to Satan, and cast him into purgatory. Who does not see that such metaphorizing is opposed to the majesty and simplicity of the Scriptures, and to the truth of God? Moreover, to represent the sinner as capable of obtaining peace with God at the moment that Justice is dragging him to the judgment-seat is to teach falsehood, and to burlesque the sacred writings. The utmost application which the text can have of a spiritual kind is this—that the prudence which dictates the necessity of an early and mutual adjustment of our legal differences with men should induce us, without delay, to seek salvation, lest vengeance suddenly overtake us. But, *Thirdly*, Even if the preposterous metaphorical application which Popery requires were admitted, still the text could avail nothing in behalf of purgatory, for this reason: in the words of Christ, the agreement with the adversary is recommended as a means of preventing our being cast into prison; but the doctrine of Popery respecting purgatory does not accord with this, for it teaches that all who are not reconciled to God on earth by the forgive-

ness of their sins are, at death, cast not into the prison of purgatory, but into the prison of hell. It is only those who are reconciled here who are admitted into purgatory hereafter. Dens, in his 'Theology,' says, 'Purgatory is a place in which the souls of the pious dead, obnoxious to temporal punishment, suffer enough or make satisfaction.'* Thus, it is the pious dead, those who *have* agreed with the adversary, who are admitted to purgatory; while those who have not agreed with him are sent to the prison of hell to all eternity. Popery, therefore, contradicts herself, and proves from her own testimony that this passage cannot apply to purgatory in any sense. If this prison be applied to the future world, it means hell, and from that the sinner will never be delivered, because the last farthing will never be paid; the requirements of justice cannot be discharged, because the sinner has nothing wherewith to pay. This the Romanists themselves everywhere maintain.

The Sin that is not Forgiven, either in this World, or in the World to Come.—Matt. xii. 32.

Another passage which the advocates of purgatory have endeavoured to press into their service is contained in Matt. xii. 32, where our Lord solemnly declares, 'And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.'

When such a passage is adduced in favour of purgatory, a considerate and unprejudiced mind must at once be satisfied that the advocates of the doctrine are hard pressed for want of Scriptural argument. We naturally inquire, What is there here said respecting purgatory? Is the existence of such a place or state asserted? Not at all. There is no allusion to its fires or its mode of penal satisfaction. It is true the 'world to come' is mentioned, but it is not mentioned as a place where sin *can* either be expiated or forgiven; but, on the contrary, as a place where sin *cannot* be forgiven; and how this language can be supposed to favour purgatory it is difficult to imagine. The mere negation of one thing does not prove or imply the

* Dens Theolog., tom. vii. Tract. de Quatuor Novissimis de Purgatorio. No. 25.

existence of its opposite. It is not, indeed, maintained by the Romanists themselves that the passage directly asserts the doctrine, but that the doctrine may be inferred from the phraseology; which, by excluding the sin against the Holy Ghost from forgiveness in the world to come, admits, they say, the supposition that some other sins may be forgiven in the world to come. The fertile imagination of a mind already prepossessed in favour of the dogma may suggest such a supposition; but certain we are that no such supposition is sanctioned by a candid and impartial consideration of the text and its parallel passages. While it is admitted by Romanists themselves that this passage asserts nothing plainly and directly respecting purgatory, it is most unfortunate for the doctrine that its phraseology is incompatible even with any inference in its favour. For the text speaks not of making *satisfaction* for sin, but of receiving the *forgiveness* of sin. We are informed, however, by the highest authorities of the Romish Church, that none can go to purgatory but those whose sins are forgiven in the present world; and the object of their being sent to purgatory is not to obtain forgiveness, but to make some penal satisfaction for sins already forgiven. Cardinal Bellarmine expressly says that 'purgatory is only for those who die in venial sins, and for those who depart this life with liability to punishment, their guilt having been already remitted.' And this is the doctrine of their standard authorities. Now this fact renders the passage before us incompatible with the doctrine of purgatory.

If it be argued that forgiveness and satisfaction are synonymous, we reply, No such thing. They express opposite ideas. Satisfaction is payment; but forgiveness is remission without payment. The one meets the requirements of justice, the other is an act of pure mercy. The Church of Rome herself notes the distinction between satisfaction and forgiveness; for the one she ascribes to God's mercy alone, the other to the sinner himself by personal suffering, or to others whose merits are said to be appropriated to his account. Forgiveness, she says, is imparted in this world; but satisfaction, in a great degree, is performed, she maintains, in the world to come, in the torments of purgatory. Thus she herself points out and contends for the broad and obvious distinction between forgive-

ness and satisfaction; and, in maintaining this distinction, she deprives herself of the possibility of pressing this passage into her service. It speaks of forgiveness only; it says nothing of satisfaction, either in this world or in the world to come.

But we go further, and maintain that, if the Church of Rome did not hold this distinction, the text in question could yield no support to her favourite dogma; for there is another view in which the phraseology of this text is incompatible with the Papal doctrine of purgatory. If the Romanist supposes that our Lord, by excepting the sin against the Holy Ghost from forgiveness in the world to come, intimates that some sins are *not* excepted from forgiveness in the world to come, it will follow, on the same principle, that *all* other sins may be pardoned in the world to come. For the sin against the Holy Ghost is the only sin he has excepted; and if that sin, which is here formally excepted, is the only one unpardonable in the world to come, then it follows that *all* others may be pardoned in the world to come. On this principle it follows that the hell of eternal misery is for none except those who sin against the Holy Ghost! This is the legitimate conclusion which flows from the principle of the Papist's reasoning; and while it is contradicted by the whole tenor of Scripture, it is contradicted also by the Papist's own doctrine of purgatory, for he maintains, as we have shown before, that *all* who die in mortal sin go direct to hell, to be punished everlastingly; that all such are excluded not only from heaven, but from purgatory itself, and consigned to hopeless, irrevocable, and eternal misery. Thus, the text is incompatible with any principle of argument which would torture it in favour of purgatory.

The true meaning of the passage we believe to be simply this: that the sin against the Holy Ghost should *never be forgiven*—that those who committed it should be totally and for ever excluded from the Divine mercy. What that particular sin was, it is not our object to investigate at length. We believe it was a wilful and determined resistance of the evidence afforded by the Saviour's miraculous works, and a malignant ascription of those works to a diabolical agency, as when the Pharisees said of Christ, 'He casteth out devils by the power of Beelzebub, the prince of devils.' This sin involved such determined resistance to the clearest evidence, and such an

audacious insult to the truth, the love, and the majesty of the Holy Spirit, as excluded men for ever from the Divine mercy, and led the Redeemer himself to declare that it should never be forgiven.

The phrase, 'Neither in this world, neither in the world to come,' was used as a proverbial expression among the Jews, and it was intended to indicate emphatically that a thing *should never take place*, when it was said, 'It shall not be either in this world or in the world to come.' We have, however, a more weighty reason for regarding the proper meaning to be that which we have stated—namely, the fact that it is supported and borne out by parallel passages. Thus, in the preceding verse, our Lord utters the same solemn truth in the form of a simple negative: 'Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men.' In the Gospel by Mark, the same awful truth is given in another form, expressing both an exclusion from pardon and an exposure to eternal damnation. 'He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is subject to eternal damnation'*—iii. 29. In Luke the same awful truth is expressed by a simple negative: 'And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven'—xii. 10. These parallel passages preclude all doubt as to the true meaning of our Lord's words. They show that he intended most emphatically to declare that blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is a sin for which there is no forgiveness, no hope of mercy.

The fact is, the dogma of purgatory was not originally based on this scripture; but after it had become established as an element of Papal theology, Papal commentators and doctors, eager to find some Scriptural countenance for their notion, availed themselves of every peculiar phrase or turn of speech which a perverse ingenuity could torture into their service. Hence we find that early Fathers of the Church neither gave this passage the modern Papal application, nor intimated that any such use was made of it by other writers. Hilary

* The word ἔνοχος is feebly rendered in our translation by the word 'danger.' The meaning of the word is *bound, liable, obnoxious, subject to punishment.*

remarks, that Christ in this passage 'condemns the perverseness of the Pharisees with marked severity, promising the pardon of all sins, but withholding indulgence or mercy from blasphemy against the Spirit. For whereas other words and deeds are freely pardoned, the denial of God in Christ is shut out from mercy.'* Ambrose remarks that 'whosoever shall not receive the remission of sins in this world, will not be in heaven.'† Jerome, in his commentary on this passage, gives precisely the same interpretation as Protestants in general, affirming, 'Whosoever shall ascribe the works of the Saviour to Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, and shall say that the Son of God hath an unclean spirit, his blasphemy shall at no time be forgiven.'‡ Chrysostom, in his homily on this text, asserts, 'Your blasphemy will be unpardonable, and ye will suffer punishment both here and hereafter.'§ From the whole argument we think it will be evident to every unprejudiced mind, that the notion of purgatory derives not the least sanction from this portion of Scripture: and the fact of its being adduced in favour of the doctrine reveals the consciousness which Romanists must feel of the extreme weakness of their cause. Although Cardinal Bellarmine quotes this passage in favour of purgatory, yet, in concluding, he confesses, '*Non sequi secundum regulas dialectorum*'—the doctrine does not logically follow from this passage.

'*Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die.*'
Isa. xxii. 14.

Another passage sometimes quoted in favour of purgatory is Isa. xxii. 14:—'Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die, saith the Lord God of hosts.' Much prominence, however, is not given to this portion of Scripture, nor great stress laid upon it by the Romanists; and this fact may be regarded as indicating a feeling that it is not much calculated to strengthen their cause. As there is here no mention made of purgatory, nor even of a future world, Papal doctors find it a difficult task to extort from it even an indirect

* Hilar. Pictav. comment. in Matt. xii. 31, col. 671. Paris, 1693.
† Ambros. de Bono Mortis, cap. ii. sec. 5, tom. i. col. 391. D. Paris, 1686.
‡ Lib. ii. tom. iv. col. 49, 50. Paris, 1706.
§ Tom. i. p. 475. Paris, 1636.

inference in favour of the dogma; yet, because it is here declared that one specified instance of iniquity should not be purged from certain Jews until they died, it is argued that the iniquity should be purged from them *after* death. This, however, is a conclusion without premises—an inference without analogy, example, or any description of evidence to give it the least shadow of probability. The principle on which this inference is drawn is this: that anything which God says he will not do in this world we are authorized to expect he will do in the next; or what he declares shall not transpire at one period shall take place at another; than which mode of reasoning nothing can be more puerile or absurd. To show its palpable absurdity, let it be applied in a few instances. In one place God says to his Son, 'Sit thou at my right hand *until* I make thine enemies thy footstool.' Are we then to infer that *after* Christ's enemies are subdued he will no longer sit at his Father's right hand? The same particle is used in both passages. Our Lord says, '*till* heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law of God.' Are we, then, to suppose that *after* the heavens and earth have passed away God's nature will change, and the principles of his government will be abrogated? The same phraseology is applied to human transactions. Paul, writing to Timothy, thus exhorts him: '*Till* I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine, and neglect not the gift that is in thee.' Are we, then, to suppose that, *after* Paul should come to him, he was to give up reading, exhortation, and doctrine, and neglect the gift that was in him? Puerile and superlatively ridiculous as these inferences are, they are precisely such as Popish doctors draw from the passage under consideration, when they contend that, because God declared concerning some wicked Jews that their sins should not be purged *till* they died, therefore they should be purged *after* death.

A moment's consideration of the context will show that the sin which these Jews had committed, the judgment denounced against them, and the period of its fulfilment, are such as totally exclude the possibility of the application of the words to purgatory in any shape or form. These Jews were not ordinary transgressors, but openly licentious and daring rebels against God. They were characters habitually revelling

in the practice of what the Church of Rome denominates 'mortal sins.' They were persons openly and notoriously wicked, such as the Church of Rome herself consigns at once to hell without the benefit of her purgatory. When God admonished them, they despised him; when he commanded them to humble themselves by repentance and fasting, they insulted him by feasting and banqueting (verses 12, 13). And such, indeed, were their crimes, that Jehovah solemly denounces his judgments against them, and declares that his vengeance should pursue them even unto death. Unconcerned at the solemn message of the Almighty, they contemptuously and presumptuously said, one to another, 'Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we shall die' (verse 13). Then the prophet immediately adds, 'And it was revealed in mine ears by the Lord of hosts, Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die, saith the Lord God of hosts'—that is, he would cause his visible displeasure to rest upon them to the latest period of life; his judgments should pursue them until not one should be left in the land of the living. Seeing, then, it is maintained by the Church of Rome that only the pious and the godly, such as fear God and obtain forgiveness in this life, are admitted to purgatory, it is evident that, on her own principles the doctrine can derive no support from this portion of Scripture.

The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus.—Luke xvi. 19—31.

Another passage adduced by Papal divines is that containing the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, in Luke xvi. 19—31. Bishop Milner asks, 'What place must that be which our Saviour calls Abraham's bosom, where the soul of Lazarus reposed among the other just souls, till he by his sacred passion paid their ransom? Not heaven, otherwise Dives would have addressed himself to God instead of Abraham; but evidently a middle state.' *

This is a remarkable piece of theology, one every way worthy of a Roman prelate. It is a kind of literary curiosity. The place which the learned bishop has chosen for purgatory is singular enough—a place of comfort and enjoyment, a place

* Milner's 'End of Controversy,' letter iv. p. 369.

where Lazarus reclines on Abraham's bosom, in an attitude of peace, contentment, satisfaction, and honour! On earth he received 'evil things'—poverty, affliction, and degradation—but in purgatory his condition is amazingly improved; he is 'comforted,' honoured, and blessed. What a different place is the purgatory of Milner from the purgatory of Catholic divines in general! Delahogue, whose theological writings are used as a class-book at Maynooth College, says that 'theologians commonly believe that souls are tortured in some kind of fire.' * The Romish Catechism maintains that 'the punishment of purgatory surpasses all temporal punishments of this life.' † And Cardinal Bellarmine asserts that 'the Fathers constantly teach that the punishments of purgatory are most excruciating, and that no pains of this life are to be compared with them.' ‡ With such contradictions before us, the question need scarcely be put, Which of these authorities are true? but, rather, Is it not presumptive that they are all false together? This is certain: if the testimony of Milner be true, purgatory is a place of so much blessedness that we cannot distinguish it from heaven itself, and none need fear admission to its happy abode, much less pay for masses to be delivered from its pains.

The purgatory of Bishop Milner is remarkable as a place frequented by holy angels; for we are informed by the Saviour that 'when Lazarus died, he was carried by angels to Abraham's bosom.' Now, the common description of purgatory is that of a fiery prison or gloomy dungeon, where devils in odious forms are the tormentors of human souls; but that of Dr Milner is a peaceful Elysium to which angels soar, and is known by the mild and attractive designation of '*Abraham's bosom*'—a name indicative of neither fires, smoke, nor furies, but of paradisaical peace, honour, and enjoyment.

It is remarkable, too, that Bishop Milner contrives to put the most illustrious patriarch, Abraham, into purgatory. Other Papal writers tell us that purgatory is for imperfect characters, who leave the world with stains and defilement, unfitting them for immediate admission to heaven; but Dr Milner selects the noblest pattern of faith and obedience furnished in

* Delahogue, de Pœnitentia, p. 394.
† Catech. ad Paroch., p. 74. Lugd., 1579.
‡ Bellarm., Opera, tom. 2; de Purgat., lib. 2, cap. xiv. Colon. 1628.

he Old Testament, and consigns him to purgatory with the est. When the penitent thief expired, though he found mercy t the eleventh hour, his spirit was admitted at once to para- lise ; but Abraham, the father of the faithful and the friend of God, after walking with God for a century, is unceremoniously ent to the regions of purgatory. Really, this bishop seems to know the destiny of the patriarch much better than the inspired writers do ; for they uniformly speak of not only Abraham, but lso his less eminent descendants, Isaac and Jacob, as being in he kingdom of heaven. If, therefore, we believe the Scriptures, ve must reject the bishop's reasoning as puerile, and his pur- gatory as fiction.

The reason which the bishop assigns for his believing the bode of Abraham and Lazarus to be purgatory is also remark- bly sagacious ! He says, had they been in heaven, Dives would have addressed himself to God instead of Abraham ; there- ore they were evidently in purgatory. That such a reason may atisfy Dr Milner's mind we do not for a moment question, for e seems to possess an enormous capacity for credulity ; but nen of common minds will hardly deem the conduct of the ich man, in praying to Abraham and not to God, a conclusive vidence of a purgatory. Indeed, if the Papal custom of pray- ng to saints be a good one on earth, why should the bishop ink it strange in Dives praying to a saint when in hell ? Was not the conduct of Dives perfectly orthodox ? Is it not nctioned by the bishop's own example ? Dives saw the triarch when he prayed to him, but Romanists pray to saints hom they never see ! On the principles of Romanism, Dives as perfectly right in praying to a saint, and deserves the shop's commendation for a practice so thoroughly orthodox. is worthy of notice that the only instance of praying to ints recorded in the whole Bible is that of Dives praying to braham. If, therefore, the Romish doctors want Scripture ample for their practice, here it is, though it is the only in- ance, and they have to go to the bottomless pit to find it. If ey will have such infernal patronage we are sorry for them ; d the poor success of the rich man's prayers to Abraham af- rds them but small encouragement to follow his example.

We may safely dismiss the bishop's remarkable comment on is parable, by observing : *First*, the design of the Saviour, in

contrasting the eternal condition of Dives and Lazarus, was not to show that one was in hell and the other next door to it—in purgatory—but to show that while the one was in hell the other was in heaven. *Secondly*, the state of comfort and enjoyment realized by Lazarus proves him to be in heaven, and is totally incompatible with the doleful regions and excruciating pains of purgatory; and, *thirdly*, the Scriptures repeatedly and expressly speak of Abraham as being in heaven. Our Lord himself has declared, 'I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.'—Matt. viii. 11. These facts exclude the possibility of the Papal bishop rationally appropriating this parable to subserve the cause of purgatory.

'*And there shall in no wise enter anything that defileth*,' *&c.*—Rev. xxi. 27.

Another passage urged in support of purgatory is contained in Rev. xxi. 27—'And there shall in no wise enter into it (the new Jerusalem) anything that defileth, neither worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.' Here again, however, no direct evidence is adduced, but, as usual, we are presented with an *inference*. It is urged that, inasmuch as it is asserted that nothing that defileth shall enter the new Jerusalem, and no one, except apostles, martyrs, and those who die immediately after baptism, can leave the world without some stain or defilement, there must be some place in which the soul is purged from its stains and made meet for glory. If this reasoning were sound, surely in connection with such a statement as the one before us in this passage, there ought to be at least some intimation that there is such a place as purgatory, where this purification can be effected for us. Indeed, this passage, which speaks so plainly of the state of souls in the eternal world, and which so pointedly excludes all from heaven but those who are free from all defilement, is one of the most likely places where some intimation should be found respecting a purgatory, if there be such a place. Yet in vain do we search the passage through for a hint of such a place. The same ominous silence prevails here as elsewhere. Heaven and hell are constantly spoken of

the invisible world is constantly laid open to our view, the eternal state of the righteous and the state of the wicked are presented in almost every page of the New Testament, and especially in the book of Revelation; yet this purgatory is never seen, never mentioned, never hinted at. The constant silence of Scripture respecting a purgatory can only be rationally accounted for by the fact that no such place has existence.

But let us look at the premises on which the Romanist concludes that the existence of a purgatory is rational. He says that none but apostles, martyrs, and those who die immediately after baptism, leave the world without some stain of moral defilement, and therefore a place of *post-mortem* purification is necessary. We ask from what source does he derive this information? Who told him that none but apostles, martyrs, and those recently baptized, leave the world so free from defilement as to be prepared for immediate admission to heaven? Has he got this knowledge from the Scriptures? Nay, verily, they teach no such doctrine. Do *they* attach this peculiar sanctity to the office of apostle? How, then, is it that they narrate the fact, that one apostle treacherously betrayed his Lord to his murderers with a kiss, and afterwards hanged himself; and that another denied him with oaths and curses, and the rest forsook him and fled? Do the Scriptures teach that all martyrs necessarily die in a state fit for heaven? How, then, is it that they solemnly declare that if a man should give his body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth him nothing? Do the Scriptures teach us that all newly baptized persons are so peculiarly favoured as to be fit for heaven? How, then, is it that they tell us of the newly baptized Simon Magus, Ananias, and Sapphira, whose iniquities showed them to be after baptism in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity? Do the Scriptures exclude common Christians from that personal purity which qualifies the soul to enter heaven without passing through purgatory? Why, then, is it that they describe them as being made new creatures in Christ Jesus, as renewed in the spirit of their minds, as cleansed from their sins, as sanctified and justified, as freed from all condemnation and guilt, as the sons of God, as the heirs of God, as having the witness that they are his children, and as rejoicing in hope of eternal glory? Are these representations of Scrip-

ture compatible either with the exclusive prerogatives ascribed by the Romanists to apostles, martyrs, and newly baptized persons, or with the gloomy destiny of ordinary Christians to an indefinite period of purgatorial torments to fit them for heaven? The truth is, Popery does not understand the Gospel, and therefore invests a few with privileges which are held out as the common blessings attainable by all, ascribes that renewing efficacy to purgatorial fire which the Scriptures ascribe to the blood of Christ and the influence of the Holy Spirit, and defers that important work of sanctification to be wrought in eternity, which the Scriptures uniformly declare can only be wrought in the present life. In that passage we have been specially noticing, the admission of souls to the new Jerusalem is not assigned to purgatorial fires, but to the fact that their names were written in the Lamb's book of life; or, in other words, they were accepted as God's people because they had washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb; while others were rejected because they had not this title, for they were still in their natural defilement and guilt. And the rejection of the one, and the reception of the other are followed by a solemn declaration which fixes the character and state of both as unalterable and eternal. 'He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still.'—Rev. xxii. 11.

We have now examined every passage on which the Church of Rome builds the doctrine of purgatory, and find that it has no foundation in the authority of God. We have seen, indeed, that on most of the passages adduced, her own testimony is faltering, equivocal, and contradictory; and not one portion of Scripture, when candidly examined, affords the least countenance to the notion she holds forth as so important. This absence of a Scriptural warrant for purgatory has more than once been felt and acknowledged by her warmest advocates. Trevern, Bishop of Strasburg, makes this remarkable confession respecting purgatory: 'Had it been necessary for us to be instructed in such questions, Jesus would doubtless have revealed the knowledge of them: he has not done so; we can therefore only form conjectures on the subject, more or less perfect.' Cardinal Wiseman confesses, too, that on the subject

of purgatory the Scriptures are 'obscure, and do not lead to any certain results,' but only 'guide us to some striking probabilities.' It is well to see the mental impressions of men of education and authority, such as bishops and cardinals, respecting this doctrine. Here, then, it comes out; and what is it? —a 'conjecture,' a 'probability,' respecting which the Scriptures 'lead us to no certain results!' But if, after all, it is confessed that purgatory has no foundation except human *conjectures*' and '*probabilities*,' what shall we say of a Church which enforces these conjectures as matters of undoubted truth, as articles of faith, and compels men to believe them on pain of eternal damnation?

SECTION V.—THE WHOLE TENOR OF SCRIPTURE CONTRADICTS THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY.

1. The Scriptures declare emphatically that Christ is the only way by which we may obtain salvation and eternal life. 'I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.'—John xiv. 6. 'Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.'—Acts iv. 12. If this be true, Popery is false; for it holds out purgatorial fire and torments as *another* way, at least as a supplementary way, whereby men may be saved.

2. The Scriptures assign our salvation *exclusively* to the sacrificial death of the Redeemer, as the procuring cause thereof: 'He was wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.'—Isa. liii. 5. If this be true, Popery is false; for it teaches that we are saved in part, by our own stripes and sufferings in purgatory. The Apostle Peter declares that we are 'not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.'—1 Peter i. 18, 19. But if this be true, Popery is false; for it teaches that men *are* saved by corruptible things, by silver and gold paid for masses, by the efficacy of which men's souls are purged from the stains and defilements of sin, and delivered from the pains of purgatory. The Church of God is described

as exclaiming, 'Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.'—Rev. i. 5, 6. But if purgatory be true, we must sing this song with bated breath and much mental reservation; for we owe our final purification in part to ourselves, by personal suffering, and in part to the merits and masses of others, to procure our release by purgatorial fires.

3. The agent of our sanctification is set forth as the Holy Ghost. It is his office to sprinkle clean water upon us, and make us clean; to cleanse us from all our filthiness; to give us a new heart; to make us holy, and present us finally to God, without spot, or blemish, or any such thing.—Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26; Rom. xv. 16; Eph. v. 26, 27. If we believe these scriptures we must reject Popery, which ascribes our final purification to penal sufferings in the world to come.

4. The conditions of our salvation are repentance and faith alone, and not in any degree as arising from personal sufferings: 'Repent ye, and believe the Gospel.' 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' 'For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.' 'By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.'—Mark i. 15; Acts xvi. 31; Rom. iv. 3—5; Eph. ii. 8. These Scriptures do not blend penal sufferings with faith as conjoint conditions of our salvation, but speak of repentance and faith alone; but the Church of Rome adds to repentance another condition—penal sufferings in purgatory. There is no mode of reconciling these; they are as opposed to one another as darkness is to light, as falsehood is to truth.

5. The nature of our salvation on earth is always described as complete, and not as requiring perfection after death. Are we pardoned? Our pardon is complete, wanting nothing. We 'are justified from all things.'—Acts xiii. 39. 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus. Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?'—

Rom. viii. 1, 33, 34. 'Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.'—Isa. i. 18. Are believers set forth as being sanctified? The same completeness is applied to their purity in this life, and no moral defilement is left to be removed by any purgatorial fires. For if we confess our sins, God is faithful and just, not only to forgive us our sins, but 'to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.'—1 John i. 9. The Apostle prays for believers, that the very God of peace may sanctify them wholly, and preserve their whole spirit, and soul, and body, blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; and he immediately adds, 'Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it.'—1 Thess. v. 23, 24. From these passages it is evident that our pardon, when received, is complete, and leaves no penalty behind to be endured in a future life; and our nature is to be so sanctified while in this world that no spot or stain shall remain to be removed in the world to come. The system that denies these plain and emphatic declarations is to be rejected as changing the truth of God into a lie.

6. All the exhortations to salvation, and all the solemn warnings and expostulations, which God addresses to man respecting his eternal destiny, refer him to two states of being only—eternal happiness and eternal misery—and declare the present life the only period when the one may be secured, and the other may be shunned; no middle state is mentioned, and no future period for purification is implied. 'I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life.'—Deut. xxx. 19. 'Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.'—2 Cor. vi. 2. Death closes the period of man's opportunities and the time of his probation. 'It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment.'—Heb. ix. 27. 'And now also the ax is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.'—Matt. iii. 10. 'If the tree fall toward the south, or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be.'—Eccles. xi. 3. 'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest.'—Eccles. ix. 10.

'He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still.'—Rev. xxii. 11. It is because man's eternal destiny is suspended upon his conduct here, that all the solemn injunctions of Christ are urged upon us to be constantly ready for that uncertain hour when he shall summon us away. 'Be ye therefore ready also: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh.' But by the doctrine of purgatory all these solemn warnings, admonitions, and exhortations are neutralized, for the awful truths on which they are based are undermined.

7. The descriptions we have of glorified spirits in heaven present them as having passed direct from earth to the throne of God, and as having obtained their meetness for heaven, not by purgatorial fires or sufferings, but by the blood of Christ. 'After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb. And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they? And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest.' Now, what was the answer given by the elder? Was it that they had come from purgatory, and had been fully and finally cleansed by its flames? No. This was the answer—'And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.'—Rev. vii. 9, 10, 13, 14. They had passed at once from their sufferings on earth to their glorious reward, and had obtained their purity by faith in the blood of the Lamb.

There is not a single aspect in which we can contemplate man's salvation, the period of his probation, and his destiny for and condition in the eternal world, but the theory of Popish purgatory contradicts the word of God. It dishonours the Author of our salvation, by making the Lord Jesus only a partial Saviour; it detracts from the efficacy of his atoning death, and the influence of the Holy Spirit; it changes the conditions of man's salvation, and curtails its blessings here

that it may provide for purgatorial suffering hereafter; it flatters the sinner with hopes of opportunities beyond the bounds which God has assigned to them, and prolongs the believer's sufferings indefinitely beyond the period when God shall have wiped away all tears from his eyes. It insults God, deceives and ruins man, and corrupts and perverts the sacred Scriptures.*

CHAPTER XVI.

THE RESURRECTION.

THE Gospel is a perfect remedial scheme. Originating in the boundless love of God, it comprises a complete salvation for man, and provides for removing entirely the curse and effects of sin from all those who accept its blessings, and for fulfilling in their final destiny the original purposes of Divine benevolence. Now, as the curse of sin affects man's physical as well as his spiritual nature, it seems reasonable to suppose that if the Gospel be a complete remedy for man, it will ultimately remove the curse from his body, as well as from his soul; and hence it may be predicated that the resurrection and glorification of the body must follow as an effect of the perfection and completeness of the Gospel remedy. This will appear the more obvious, if it can be shown that the glorification of the body, as well as the soul, entered into the original purpose of Jehovah in man's creation; and that such was the benevolent design of our Creator will appear highly probable from the following considerations:—

Man is a compound being, consisting of the soul and the body. The union of these two natures is essential to the completeness and perfection of a human being. The union between the soul and body would have been permanent and eternal had man

* To those who desire to investigate this subject further, and to examine collateral topics on the Papal controversy, the author would recommend the erudite work of Edgar on 'The Variations of Popery,' Ellis's 'Delineation of Popery,' Hall on 'The Doctrine of Purgatory and the Practice of Praying for the Dead,' and Pearson on 'The Creed.' These works the writer has consulted in preparing this chapter, especially as to the sentiments of the Fathers, though in all important quotations he has examined the originals for himself.

retained his innocence. Immortality was originally the inheritance of the body as well as of the soul; but it was suspended on man's obedience; and therefore, had man never sinned he would never have died. Yet probably in that case the body would, at some period of man's being, have become the subject of a great transformation. This seems necessary to answer the requirements of an eternally progressive nature; for though a body with animal instincts and appetites was adapted to Adam in the infancy of his being, yet not for that endless advancement which lay before him. The soul is endowed with capabilities for everlasting expansion, refinement, and elevation, and a corresponding refinement or transformation of the body seems to have been necessary to render it adapted to the advanced stages of his immortal existence; and such a glorious change, we may assume, would, in due time, have been effected by the translation of man's whole nature to a higher state of being. Probably, in the translation of Enoch and Elijah, we have a representation of an event that would have been as frequent in its occurrence in a world of innocence, as death is now in a world of apostasy and sin. If, then, the Gospel, while providing fully for the restoration of the soul, provides also for the resurrection and glorification of the body, and its reunion with the soul, it thereby asserts its completeness and perfection as a remedial scheme; it effectually repairs the breach which sin has made in our condition; it frustrates the malignant designs of the great destroyer, and places the believer finally in a position equal, at least, to that which man would have attained if the apostasy had never blighted our being, nor the curse of sin entered into our world. That such is the completeness and perfection of the Gospel will now be shown, for it not only declares in general terms, that where sin abounded grace has much more abounded, but it explicitly reveals the resurrection of the body and the glorification of our whole nature in eternal exaltation and blessedness.

Direct Evidence of the Resurrection.—The doctrine of the resurrection is derived exclusively from revelation. It is too recondite to find a place in the speculations of human philosophy, or even in the conjectures of man's fertile imagination. But in the volume of Revelation it has a conspicuous place, and appears even amid the shadows of the patriarchal

dispensation. The translation of Enoch was a glorification of man's whole nature, and a confirmation of a truth which had probably a place in the earliest revelation given to man. Job, though a Gentile by birth, and probably a contemporary with the later Jewish patriarchs, could exult amid the anguish of a diseased and emaciated body, and the desolation of all his earthly hopes, in prospect of a glorious resurrection, exclaiming, 'I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.'—Job xix. 25, 26. Isaiah, addressing the Jewish Church in the midst of her afflictions and calamities, comforts her with the hope of a resurrection to everlasting life: 'Thy dead men shall live, *together* with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.'—Isa. xxvi. 19. Daniel, anticipating the closing events of time, and the final destiny of men, says, 'And many (the multitude) of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.'—Dan. xii. 2. Sustained by this hope, the Hebrew worthies endured with fortitude and joy the tortures of martyrdom, 'not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection.' In the time of our Lord's ministry, the doctrine of the resurrection was one of popular belief. Martha only gave utterance to the prevalent sentiment, when she said to our Lord concerning her departed brother, 'I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.' In the New Testament this doctrine, freed from every vestige of obscurity, stands out with constant prominence, both in the teachings of our Lord and of his apostles. Says the Redeemer to the disconsolate sister of Lazarus: 'I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die.'—John xi. 25, 26. 'Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.'—John vi. 54. 'Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.'—John v. 28, 29.

The apostles proclaimed this doctrine with the same constancy that they declared any vital truth of Christianity. They preached Jesus and the resurrection, and the one theme was inseparable from the other. In asserting the fact of our Lord's resurrection, they adduce it as an evidence and a prototype of our resurrection, and regard the general resurrection as an event so certainly connected with the resurrection of our Lord, that to deny it was in effect to deny that our Lord himself had risen from the tomb, and thus to undermine the whole Christian fabric. 'Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.'—1 Cor. xv. 12—22. Such is the clear and explicit form in which this doctrine is revealed in the sacred volume; such is the solid foundation of the believer's hope.

Objections answered.—This sublime doctrine not only transcends the power of human discovery, but has had to encounter the objections urged by unbelief, in both ancient and modern times. While heathenism included it not in its belief, philosophy discarded it as an impossibility and an absurdity. Passing by the ancient theory which regarded matter as essentially evil, the prevalent objections of modern unbelievers are grounded on the dissolution of the body, and the subsequent assimilation and transmutation of its particles. Let these two ideas, involved in the objection, be separately answered.

1. Decomposition is not annihilation. The decomposition of a body is nothing more than the separation of its parts

and whether the component parts of a body be dissolved by the slow process of putrefaction, or the rapid operation of combustion, or some active chemical analysis, those parts, however diminutive, remain in existence. Though reduced to their ultimate atoms, they still have an existence and a locality as real as the largest globes that sweep through immensity.

2. Neither does the dissolution of a body involve the impossibility of the re-composition of its parts. As all the parts of the whole still exist, they may be re-united. Nature changes water into ice, and ice into water, thus restoring the same particles unto their original composition; and, in fact, in all Nature's operations we behold ever-recurring cycles of renovation and decay, of dissolution and re-composition. Men, too, by chemical agency, can change hard, solid metals into liquids, and pour them from vessel to vessel, and again restore the liquids into solid metallic substances. If Nature, in her ordinary operations, dissolves existing substances and re-unites them; and if men, by availing themselves of Nature's laws, can do the same in some respects, why cannot the great Creator re-compose the human structure out of its dissolved elements? Though this is an effort beyond the power of Nature, it is not beyond the power of the God of Nature.

3. The fact that the particles of a human body after death become scattered, can present no difficulty with God, simply because he is God, and therefore has both wisdom and power to execute the purposes of his will. It matters not how widely dispersed, nor how multifariously combined, the atoms which once composed the human body—they still exist: and because God is omniscient, he knows where they are; and because he is omnipresent, they are under his control. God sees each atom, and knows to what body it belongs; for his presence fills all space, and his eye sees all things.

4. Jehovah is also infinite in power as well as in knowledge, and therefore, while nothing can be too diminutive or complicated for him to know, nothing can be too hard for him to do. If his omniscience implies a perfect knowledge of each atom, does not his omnipotence imply the power to bring them together, and re-unite them into one system? Did he at first create the body, and create the atoms, too, out of which it was formed, and can he not fashion it again out of the materials

made already to his hand? Reason says he can, and Holy Scripture says he will.

But against this conclusion it is alleged that the laws of assimilation and transmutation present an insuperable barrier; for some savage tribes devour one another; and not only so, but, as a general rule, past generations, on decomposing, become assimilated into the various forms of vegetable and animal life, and thereby afford, in part, the aliment of which future generations are composed; and hence the restoration of each identical body is impossible.

(*a*) We reply that, happily for mankind, the horrid custom of cannibalism has been extremely limited, and, when practised, it does not necessarily follow that a portion of one human body so devoured is permitted permanently to become assimilated into another; for if an assimilation of such should take place in a few solitary instances, he who made the body could easily cause such particles to pass away. Moreover, the operations of the laws of transmutation and assimilation are too occult and complicated for either observation or experiment to determine their ultimate effect, as to each or any of the particles of food received into the system; and unless this were done, any conclusion drawn against the identity of the body at the resurrection is a conclusion drawn in the dark. It is to reason from our ignorance of philosophy against our knowledge of the plainest revelation.

(*b*) The fact that God has predicted the resurrection, is itself a guarantee that he will fulfil it; and we have only to suppose that his wisdom and power are employed in fulfilling the purposes of his Gospel, even as they are constantly employed in fulfilling the purposes of his Providence, and we have then philosophic ground for our faith. In the economy of Nature, God's agency extends to the control and direction of the minutest particles of matter. And the whole history of Providence furnishes evidence of the truth, that the laws and operations of Nature are subordinate and subservient to the purposes of grace and revelation. Hence the numerous miracles recorded in the sacred volume. For in every miracle, the laws of Nature have been suspended, altered, or reversed, by the special interposition of Almighty power, in subservience to a purpose connected with human salvation. Nature is but the

instrument of God, and must do his will; the Bible is God's revealed will, and the operations of Nature cannot frustrate that will. The resurrection of the body will be a stupendous miracle; but if it should require a continued series of prior miracles to secure its accomplishment, we hesitate not to believe it, for it is in character with God's previous goodness to man: our wonder is already lost in the greater miracle of our redemption by Jesus Christ. The resources of infinite wisdom and power are laid under tribute to accomplish the purposes of benevolence toward man, and fulfil the declarations of unchanging faithfulness and truth. Here, then, is the ground of our confidence in the resurrection of the body—*God hath said it.*

The Doctrine in harmony with the Analogy of Nature.—Although the resurrection has no parallel in the operations of Nature, and derives no proof therefrom, yet changes and transformations, constantly going on in the economy of Nature, bear such an analogy to the resurrection, as shows that this predicted event is one by no means discordant with existing facts. Look at the continual process of renovation and decay in the vegetable kingdom. In summer, vegetation flourishes in the full vigour of its maturity; in autumn, it declines; in winter, a great portion of it dies, and the remainder sinks into a state of torpor analogous to death. But in spring it revives, and all Nature rejoices in new life, and puts on an efflorescence of beauty and luxuriant fecundity. Look at the reviviscence and transformations of some parts of the animal kingdom. That unsightly creature crawling on the foliage is the larva of a beautiful winged insect, now in the first stage of its existence, and is on its way to a higher state of being. In a short time it weaves for itself a silken shroud, then, changing its form, it passes into a chrysalis state, and remains torpid and entombed for some months. But under the genial influence of a summer's sun it revives, bursts its tomb, and appears a lively, beautiful creature of another character. Every vestige of its former mean existence has disappeared. Elegant in form, gay with all the hues of light, and endowed with new powers of activity, and new faculties of enjoyment, it spreads its gossamer wings to the balmy air, inhales the nectar of flowers, and basks in the solar ray. Now

here, if not a resurrection, there is something like it, in which most of the same particles are raised and transformed, and the creature enters upon a new and advanced stage of existence—a change for a worm which may well render credible that which is promised to man.

We have inspired authority and example for referring to the analogy of Nature on the subject of the resurrection. The Apostle Paul, in answering the cavils of an objector, says, 'Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die: and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain: but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.' The leaves, the stalk, and the whole fabric of the plant die; only a minute grain called the seed remains, and even this must be subject to decay and partial dissolution, before the rising germ appears. The lobes and farinaceous parts of the seed itself perish, and become nutriment to the surviving germ, which soon shoots forth, and, assimilating the surrounding particles of earth, and fed by the rains and atmosphere, and cherished by the solar rays, rises into a form equal in size and beauty to the parent plant.

But in the Apostle's words there is a great principle involved, which applies to the general process of both animal and vegetable existence. It is this—that the death of one generation is necessary to the life of another, and that the various forms of vegetable and animal life are but the reviviscence of particles of matter which were previously dead. If the science of geology be true, the existence of successive generations, after the creation of the first races, has been continued through the agency of death. In reference to all the higher forms of life God has made, death is the necessary antecedent, and the sustainer of life. Death, in the vegetable creation, forms the grand platform of all subsequent existence in the animal creation. The surface soil which covers the face of the earth is formed of the accumulations of death. The vegetation that crowns the landscape, and the numerous forms of animal existence in earth or ocean, are made up, in a great degree, of the spoils of death—are composed of particles which had previously passed through the process of life and of death; and

in some of these particles that process had been repeated a thousand times. Every fabric of organized matter, then, is built up in a considerable degree of particles which had been previously dead; but they have become assimilated and vitalized, and take their places again in animated being. Thus the returning of dead matter to actual life is a constant process in the economy of Nature; and the resurrection of the human body itself is but the collection, re-construction, and vitalization of the particles which had existed in human nature before. Looking then at the distinct and emphatic enunciations of revelation, at the harmony presented in the analogy of Nature, and the infinite resources of the Almighty Creator, we may well interrogate the objector with astonishment at his incredulity, and say, 'Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?'

We now proceed to speak of the nature and properties of the body in the resurrection.

1. As to the identity of the body in the resurrection. The word resurrection (*ἀνάστασις*) means 'a standing up again,' and when applied to the body expresses its return to life. It was the same body of Christ that died and was buried, that rose again on the third day. In the case of the saints that rose again after our Lord's resurrection, the same bodies which had putrefied in their tombs were raised, and appeared unto many. For it is expressly stated, that 'the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of their graves after his resurrection, and appeared unto many.'—Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. Enoch and Elijah took with them to heaven the same bodies in which they lived on earth. Our Lord, in speaking of the resurrection, says, that 'all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth.' And it cannot be denied that the general teachings of Scripture broadly represent the resuscitation of the same body which lives and dies. At the same time, the phraseology of Scripture is seldom used in a refined and metaphysical sense, but according to the common popular style of speaking; and hence, when the Scriptures advert to the resurrection of the same body, they do not determine, with philosophic nicety, whether or not the raised body shall consist entirely and exclusively of the identical particles which are laid in the grave,

or which belong to the body at the instant of death; but in general terms, and in a popular acceptation, they speak of that body united to the soul on earth, as the one to be re-united to the soul hereafter.

2. The glorified body will have the human form. When Elijah was translated, he ascended to heaven with the human body unchanged in its external form; and many centuries after, when that prophet and Moses appeared with our Lord on the mount of transfiguration, they both had the human form. In all the representations we have of the blessed in heaven, they appear, though resplendent in glory, in the human form. When our Lord ascended to the throne of his majesty, he took with him the same body which had been crucified, retaining the same form he had assumed in his humiliation; and in every instance of his subsequent appearance, whether to Stephen before his martyrdom, or to Saul of Tarsus on his errand of blood, or to St John in the sublime visions of the Apocalypse, he presents himself in the form of our humanity; and, finally, when he will come in the glory of his Father, to judge the world, he will appear as the Son of man. Since, then, in all the representations of the glorified the human form is preserved; and since that form is honoured as the shrine in which Jehovah-Jesus dwells, as the Advocate, the Sovereign, and the Judge of all; and since the believer is to be like his Lord when he sees him as he is, it is evident that 'the human form divine' is designed to be the permanent type of our race.

3. But though the glorified body will be formed of the same material, and retain the same general contour, as the present human fabric, it will be greatly superior in its properties and faculties. Who would presume to limit the susceptibility of matter to any required refinement and modification, under the transforming hand of its Creator? Look at the known allotropic properties of matter. In the laboratory of Nature how marvellous are the transformations constantly going on! The chemist casts sand into the fire, and it becomes glass; but the oyster, in its dark recess, elaborates the beautiful pearl from an excrescence of its own substance. Nature produces gems from earths, and forms the brilliant diamond from the same material as the dark and opaque charcoal. The artist can chisel the marble and make the canvas blush with

nimic forms; but Nature, ever active and efficient under the
and of her Creator, causes dead matter to become vitalized,
nd appropriates it to vegetable and animal organization. Plants
ut on hues of inimitable beauty, and extract from rude earths
he fluids and invisible essences that fill the air with richest
fragrance. Fleshy fibre awhile ago dull, inanimate matter, not
only participates life, but becomes mysteriously united to mind,
nd acts in concert with its invisible volitions, intellectual oper-
tions, and spiritual emotions. With such evidences of the
usceptibilities of matter under the agency of the great Creator,
e are prepared to receive, with a rational confidence, the won-
erful revelations given of the exalted properties to be possess-
d by the human body when raised from the dead. To those
evelations, then, let us now bend our attention.

'It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is
own in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weak-
ess; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is
aised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is
spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was
ade a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening
pirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that
hich is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The
st man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from
eaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy:
nd as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.
nd as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also
ar the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that
sh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither
th corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a
ystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed,
a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for
e trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorrupt-
e, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put
incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So
nen this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this
rtal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to
ss the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in
tory.'—1 Cor. xv. 42—54. Blessed God! what a glorious
covery hast thou condescended to give thy creatures of their
ure destiny, of the dignity and happiness in reserve for

them that love thee! In analyzing this sublime description of the glorified body, the following superior properties are rendered prominent:—

4. The glorified body will be immortal. 'It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption.' The present body is mortal, being subject to death as the curse and penalty of sin. But at the resurrection the curse is removed, and the body becomes naturally immortal. It is no more subject to disease, disorder, and decay. In the present world some substances are much more durable than others: thus, iron is more durable than wood, and gold more durable than iron. But platinum is said not only not to rust or corrode when exposed to air or moisture, but not to melt when exposed to the most intense heat of a furnace, and to come out bright and untarnished; yet platinum gives way and becomes dissolved by the action of powerful acids accompanied by heat. But thousands of years will bring no decay to the glorified body; it will be absolutely indestructible, immortal as the soul itself, and enjoy that perpetuity of being, which would have been its inheritance if sin had never entered into our world. Life—life, unfading and eternal life—shall be the united inheritance of both body and soul.

5. The body at the resurrection will be glorious. 'It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory.' The human body is now degraded by sin, by the diseases which flow from sin, and the mortality which is the penalty of sin. Sometimes it is defective or deformed at its birth, or infected by hereditary disease; sometimes it is maimed by accident or wasted and full of pain by affliction, haggard and withered by old age, and finally it putrefies in death. It is now a vile body, and immediately after death becomes foul to the touch, offensive to the smell, and loathsome to the sight, and worms and meanest reptiles riot on the putrefying carcase. But the body, when raised again, will be free from every vestige of the dishonour entailed upon it by sin. No putrid sores, no racking pains, no defective members, no latent diseases, no malformations, shall be either inherent in the body or contingent on its existence. It shall be wholly free from the degrading relics of our apostasy and from the possibility of their return. The risen body will be complete in its parts, perfect in its constitution, beautiful in

symmetry, and radiant in aspect. When celestial messengers have visited our world, they have shone with splendour, as if clothed with robes of light. Probably we have here the scintillations of the glory that shall be revealed in us at the last day.

6. The body at the resurrection will be vigorous and powerful. 'It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power.' Every part of the present structure and organization is characterized by a feebleness that soon becomes manifest. Hence the sense of weariness, fatigue, and exhaustion by labour. Hence its inability for any long-continued effort, and the restraints constantly put upon the operations of the intellect and the emotional powers of the mind. The body in its present state is too weak to resist the corrosion of the elements, or the wear and tear of its own operations, or the efforts of the noble powers of the soul; and after a few years it either succumbs to the power of disease, or, like a worn-out piece of mechanism, it stands still from exhaustion of the springs of action. Such a body, both in the term of its being and the feebleness of its powers, is not fitted for the soul beyond the mere period of its embryo condition. But the body, at the resurrection, shall be raised in power. Though formed of the same material as the present, yet its divine transformation will render it as different in its properties as the diamond is to a piece of charcoal, as the richest and most durable gems are to the friable earths of which they are composed. Like gold freed from all its drossy impurities, it shall be refined and purged from the last element of weakness, corrosion, and decay, and be endued with unfailing energy and immortal vigour. It will neither sink under exertion nor wrinkle with age. The vigour of youth will be the companion of its immortality. It will be strong as the soul itself, fitted for all its intense activities, its noble enterprises, and its holy enjoyments, during the whole range of its being. It will be able to sustain an exceeding great and eternal weight of glory.

7. The glorified body will be a spiritual one. 'It is sown natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.' The original words, *σῶμα ψυχικὸν*, rendered natural body, mean an *animal body*, and are thus contrasted with the words, *spiritual body*. It has many properties, instincts, appetites, habitudes, and wants,

common to itself and the inferior animals around us, and a corresponding organization. The animal body is, then, the characteristic of the body in its present state, and of which it will be divested in the resurrection, for it will then be no longer an animal body, but a spiritual body. The Apostle does not say it is to be changed into a spirit, and lose its materiality. A body it will still be, but so refined and spiritualized as to be adapted to a spiritual state of existence.

The Apostle tells us expressly that 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.' And this change in the physical texture seems to imply the absence of the circulatory, respiratory, digestive, and assimilating organs, together with all the elaborate visceral system connected with their animal functions. A spiritual body, in contradistinction to an animal body, implies also the absence of those wants, appetites, and propensities which pertain to the animal state, and a consequent freedom from the cares, exercises, and labours necessary to provide for such an inferior condition. Our Lord, rebuking the unbelief and the sensual and inferior views of the Sadducees, says of the saints in the resurrection, that 'they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.' From which it appears that the whole class of animal instincts and requirements will be purged away. In the present body, we see two kinds of organization—one to keep up the system by assimilation, and the other to supply the mind with suitable apparatus for the exercise of its powers. The former, as no longer necessary, will not be restored; but the noble organs which minister to the soul's interests will, we may presume, be restored in a highly improved state in the glorified body. Probably, indeed, the glorified body will be simple in its structure, and have no wants of its own. The imperious demands of our animal nature will be done away, and the passions allied to our inferior nature never more obtrude themselves against the interests of the soul. The body being spiritual in itself, will perfectly harmonize with the nature, the purposes, the aspirations, and affections of its spiritual occupant, and will be a noble and immortal fabric, endowed with such marvellous organs and properties, as shall render it the medium through which the soul, without any hindrance, but with the greatest facility, may put

forth its mightiest energies, rise to its highest attainments, and receive its most enlarged enjoyments.

8. The human body in the resurrection will resemble our Lord's glorified body. On this topic the following instructive and exhilarating parallel is drawn by the Apostle: 'There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.' Now here the Apostle notes two distinct epochs and orders in the history of human nature—the earthy and the heavenly: the first, the characteristic of man in his introductory state of being, and represented by Adam before he fell. The next, which characterizes the highest state of human nature, is not animal but spiritual, not earthly but heavenly; and is represented by the glorified humanity of Christ. The body of the saint, therefore, in the resurrection, is not compared with that of Adam in his innocence, because, though his body was immortal, it was earthly, and adapted then only to an earthly state of being: but it is compared to the risen body of Christ, which was not only immortal, but spiritual, heavenly, and glorified. This, then, becomes the type and pattern after which the risen bodies of the saints shall be fashioned. It is the believer's highest ambition to be like Christ on earth; it is the pleasure and the promise of Christ that he shall be like him hereafter—like him in body as well as in soul. For at his coming he 'shall change this vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.'—Phil. iii. 21. 'Beloved,' says St John, 'now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.'—1 John iii. 2. From this we see that the bodies of believers shall shine with a

splendour like that of the Saviour's body when he appeared on the mount, and like that in which he will appear when he comes to judgment.

9. A nature thus glorified must be endued with a capacity for greatly augmented joys—for a higher elevation in the condition of its being than it had in the separate state. The soul has powers yet undeveloped, which await the more favourable condition of its reunion with the glorified body. Among the inferior tribes of creation we often see powers essentially inherent, but latent in the earlier stages of their being, and undeveloped until they arrive at a more advanced stage of existence. What powers of beauty, fragrance, and fecundity lie enveloped in a single seed, but which remain latent until favourable conditions develop those powers, and a more advanced stage of being renders them evident to our admiring observation! What powers of activity and enjoyment are involved in the larvæ of some insect tribes, but remain latent within them until new conditions and a more advanced stage of being have unfolded them! If such a law of progress belongs to inferior beings, whose existence is for a few days, can it be incongruous to apply it to the noblest work of God, whose existence knows no end? What capacities and mental energies are enveloped in the embryo of a human being, which gradually discover themselves in the future history of the philosopher, in the divine, and in the spirit before the throne of God! Yet what is this brief history but the commencement of man's being, compared with those interminable ages through which he is destined to live? Looking at the eternity which lies before him, at the powers already developed, and which he exercises in the separate state, and looking at the fact that his soul is to be re-united to a body with new powers and capabilities, is it not reasonable to suppose that this new stage of his being will be opened with the development of powers hitherto latent, but then quickened into activity, and furnished with a new and suitable medium in the spiritual and immortal fabric, raised up at the coming of our Lord? The very fact that the soul is thus united to such a noble material system, endowed with new and exalted properties, we think, renders it highly probable that the design is to unfold some latent powers in the soul's mysterious being, which shall

greatly widen the range of its observation and experience, afford facilities for new and untrodden acquirements in the regions of knowledge, augment the sum of its blessedness, and render the manifestations of Deity to its consciousness more vivid and glorious.

But apart from all speculation, the fact that human nature is now actually united to the Deity, in the person of the God-man, our Lord Jesus Christ, is of itself an evidence of its capability to advance without limit and without end in every attainment that elevates and ennobles existence. The nature of Jesus is still human, however exalted, and however intimate in its union with his Deity; and it supplies us with evidence that the happiness and dignity of the human soul in eternity have no conceivable limitation; and that the body, when raised again and made like Christ's body, will be adapted to the most exalted attainments and the most refined enjoyments which the soul can realize. It is enough that our body when glorified will be like Christ's body. A nature that is a fit shrine for the Deity must be fit for the highest elevation and refinement of the man.

10. A change in all respects corresponding to this will be made in the bodies of those saints who shall be found living on the earth at the time of our Lord's appearing. The world will be populated then by the busy tribes of men as it is now, but perhaps more numerously; and though an awful apostasy will have taken place, and the faithful be diminished from among men, yet many truly righteous will be found waiting for the coming of their Lord. These, like Enoch and Elijah, shall never taste of death, but be the subjects of an instantaneous transformation. 'Behold,' says the Apostle Paul, 'I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we (that is, the living) shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.'

It only remains to observe at present that the bodies of the wicked, as well as the righteous, will be raised at the last day, but not to be glorified. Immortality and spirituality will be the properties of their bodies, as well as those of the right-

eous; and the reunion between the soul and body then effected will be eternal, but, alas! alas! it will be to develop new capabilities of suffering, and to receive the full measure of the penalty of their transgressions. For the resurrection of them that have done evil and died unforgiven will be a resurrection unto damnation, and present an everlasting manifestation of the holiness, the justice, and faithfulness of God.

CHAPTER XVII.

ETERNAL RETRIBUTION.

THE JUDGMENT.—The omniscient Jehovah himself needs not the process of an investigation and scrutiny to ascertain the character of his creatures, or to appropriate to each his equitable doom. Nor do the spirits that have already passed through the period of their probation wait until the judgment, in order to know their own character, and ascertain their destiny; for of this they are conscious immediately on entering the eternal world. Though a fatal delusion may exist up to the moment of death, it is dispelled the instant after the spirit passes beyond the confines of time. Lazarus and the rich man were each vividly conscious of their portion in the spirit world. Yet the day of judgment is necessary, that in the solemn process which evolves the character and fixes the destiny of responsible beings, the principles of Jehovah's moral government may be unfolded, and the wisdom, rectitude, and benevolence of its administration may be exhibited; and thus the glorious perfections of his character be displayed to an intelligent universe. As to the period when the judgment shall commence, neither man nor angel knoweth. The apostles, though endued with plenary inspiration, were kept, like other men, in ignorance of this period. This, like the moment of our death, is a secret thing, which belongs only to God; and the prying curiosity of those the most favoured with a knowledge of the future was met by the rebuke, 'It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power.' This we know, the judgment has been pre-

dicted in all ages, from the antediluvian era up to the closing of the canon of Scripture, and it was always represented as an event approaching, but of uncertain date. Sometimes it is spoken of as at hand. Many of the early Christians understood this literally, and expected the Redeemer to descend as Judge within the brief period of their own life—an error which was corrected by inspired authority. Scoffing unbelievers in ancient times excused their infidelity on the ground of the non-fulfilment of the predictions respecting the judgment-day, contemptuously asking, 'Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep all things remain as they were from the beginning of the creation.' But the same Divine authority which soothed the apprehensions of the Thessalonian believers, as to the immediate arrival of the judgment, furnished an answer to the scoffing infidel; and in doing so supplied an important principle of interpretation respecting the predictions of that day. The Apostle Peter, while reiterating the prophecy of the Redeemer's coming, and the awful conflagration which shall transpire at that period, accounts for the apparent delay of the event by alleging the compassionate forbearance of God, and vindicates the consistency of this postponement with the prediction of its speedy occurrence, by assigning the mighty contrast there is in the computation of time as long or short, between the mind of the eternal and unchangeable Jehovah and the contracted mind-of man. 'But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.'—2 Peter iii. 8, 9. Thus the Scriptures become their own interpreter. That which seems remote in the estimation of men, is near and even at the door in the estimation of Jehovah. Inhabiting eternity, the ages of all time are to him only as a transient episode in a drama. A thousand years are but as a day, and a day as a thousand years. All the events of time, viewed as God views them in the light of eternity, are comprised within an ephemeral period of duration, though to the creature of a day, they are often separated from each other by the intervals of slow and protracted ages. If, then, in the purpose of God, the day

of judgment should yet be postponed for a thousand years, it is but as a day with him ; and though it should even be postponed for 365 thousand years, it is but as so many days ; and is as near with God as the little round of a single year would be with man.

Whenever that day shall arrive, it will take the world by surprise. The outlines of prophecy respecting this event, and others connected with it, are not so clearly defined as to enable any human sagacity to anticipate with certainty the time when it shall transpire. While the immutability of Jehovah's purpose secures its certainty, his wisdom equally secures its secresy. For the same word which has predicted its coming has declared his intention to hide the time of its arrival from the scrutiny of man. Its hour has been uncertain in all past ages, and it shall remain so until the period when it shall burst upon a slumbering world. That it will transpire during a post-millennial apostasy appears clear ; but this defines not the time of its coming, for the exact period when the millennium itself shall either commence or close, is not known, and, perhaps, never will be known until the end of time ; and, consequently, the exact period when the subsequent apostasy shall set in must remain unknown ; and, again, equally unknown is the duration of that apostasy ; so that the time of the judgment, which follows these events, will remain a profound secret until the solemn day reveals itself. The ambiguity of prophecy and the veil of uncertainty as to the close of life, as well as to the close of time, are designed to cause deadness to the world, vigilance, holy activity, and constant readiness for the solemnities of an eternal world, and a final retribution. Hence the impressive imagery of a bridegroom coming at an unexpected hour, the lord returning to his mansion at an unlooked-for period to demand an account from his servants ; and the stealthy, unexpected intrusion of the plunderer at the silent hour of midnight, when the unconscious family are lulled in the arms of sleep ; and hence, too, the admonitory declaration of Him who sees the end from the beginning, ' But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying

and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall the coming of the Son of man be.'—Matt. xxiv. 36—39. Therefore, to prepare to meet our God is wisdom, but to attempt to determine the time of his coming is folly, and an effort approaching to profanity: for it is an attempt to discover that which God himself has informed us he has designedly hidden from every created being, both in earth and in heaven.

THE REWARD AND PUNISHMENT WILL BE ETERNAL.—This momentous truth is implied and rendered evident in our argument on the Soul's Immortality; and it is most emphatically expressed in the final sentence of the Judge—'And these shall go away into everlasting punishment.'—Matt. xxv. 46. In this awful sentence, the duration of both blessedness and misery is expressed by the same word—*αἰώνιον*. In our own version, it is true the term '*eternal*' is applied to the state of the righteous, and the term '*everlasting*' to the doom of the wicked. But this change in the term was adopted by our translators merely for the sake of variety of expression, and certainly with no view to diminish the force of the original. For while that which is *eternal* has neither beginning nor ending, that which is *everlasting* must last for ever; so that there is, in fact, no difference in the signification of the term, even in English, when applied to a future state of being.

To evade the force of this word as applied to the wicked, it is alleged that the terms 'for ever' and 'everlasting' are applied in Scripture to mountains, hills, the Jewish dispensation, &c., which it is admitted can only have a temporary duration. This is granted; but it merely shows that the term is sometimes used in Scripture, as we often use it in conversation, to express a long but indefinite period. Yet this loose application of the word does not destroy its proper meaning; and we are not to suppose, because it sometimes expresses a limited duration, that it always expresses a limited duration: for this reasoning would disprove the eternity of the happiness of the righteous as well as the misery of the wicked, and deny the eternity of God as well as the immortality of man. The word *αἰών* properly means duration so long as the nature of the substance itself can exist. Abundant examples of this might

be adduced from the Greek classics. Let one passage from Aristotle suffice. He says—'As the lifetime of man is his *αἰών* (duration), so the duration of the heavens is their sole, godlike, everliving (*αἰών*) duration.' This determines the meaning of the adjective *αἰώνιον*. It means, when applied to God, ever-during existence; when applied to heaven, ever-during happiness; and when applied to hell, or the state of the lost, ever-during punishment; and in all such cases no reasoning can logically assign to it a less duration than that which we all understand by our own words *eternal*, *ever-during*, *never-ending*. And, indeed, whenever the word 'everlasting,' or any of its equivalents, is in Scripture used for a limited period, it expresses a duration as long as the subject of it will admit; and no mistake can arise from such an application of the term, because the limited duration of the subject referred to is either implied in the same passage of Scripture, or elsewhere plainly expressed. Thus, though mountains and hills are said to be everlasting, other passages foretell the conflagration of the earth, and the consequent destruction of mountains. While some passages speak of Jewish ordinances as of everlasting duration and obligation, other texts predict the dissolution of the Jewish economy, and the introduction of the Christian dispensation in its stead. But no such limitation is either expressed or implied when the term is applied to God, because he is essentially of eternal duration; and here the word has its full and proper meaning. No such limitation is either implied or expressed when the word is applied to the human soul, or to the state of mankind in another world: it is left with its full, unqualified import, and the same term, uttered in the same breath, is applied to the state of the wicked in hell as to the state of the righteous in heaven.

In order to make the word 'everlasting' or 'eternal' express a temporary duration when applied to the punishment of the wicked, in the same manner as when applied to mountains, hills, the Jewish dispensation, &c., some passages equally plain should be adduced, which declare the existence of the wicked in hell to be but temporary, and which reveal the purpose of God to deliver the lost at some period, either by annihilation or by a restorative dispensation. But there is no such intimation. Throughout the sacred volume not a ray of mercy falls

on the dark regions of the lost, not a whisper of forgiveness is heard in the doleful caverns of woe; neither the hope of an end by annihilation, nor of recovery by any new dispensation, has any encouragement from the sacred volume. Darkness, darkness, unrelieved and impenetrable, settles on the destiny of those who reject the Gospel of the blessed God.

All the representations of the state of the lost are such as indicate an eternity of woe. What mean the undying worm, the quenchless fire, the pit of bottomless perdition, and the smoke of torment ascending up for ever and ever? Let it be granted these are images; but images of what? Has the anguish of the damned any end in these representations? Great God! what must be the infatuation of men who can extract the hope of deliverance from the representations thy faithful word has given of their irretrievable and endless suffering!

To complete the hopelessness of the sinner's doom, it is pronounced eternal at the end of the judgment dispensation. The awful sentence, 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire,' is uttered not as a threatening, but as a fulfilment of threatenings; not as a prophecy, but as the final accomplishment of a prediction at the end of time. This, therefore, is the practical exposition given by Christ himself of all the threatenings previously denounced on the ungodly in reference to their future doom. If, therefore, any limitation had been intended, this would be the occasion for its manifestation. But no such limitation appears in the final sentence. It was everlasting punishment in the Old Testament; it was everlasting punishment in the ministry of Christ; it was everlasting punishment in the ministry of the apostles; it was everlasting punishment in the closing language of the Apocalypse; and it is still everlasting punishment in the final sentence pronounced at the day of judgment. Does this stern and awful consistency in the utterances of the sinner's doom give place for presumption to speculate on the hope of deliverance?

Nor must it be forgotten, that at the period when the sentence is pronounced, not only the day of grace has expired, but the appointed medium of mercy is closed, and the sinner has entered upon a new dispensation of wrath and vengeance. On the day of judgment the Redeemer leaves the mediatorial throne, and puts off his sacerdotal robes; he ceases to intercede;

his name is no longer the sinner's plea, and the Spirit no longer strives with men. The whole mediatorial system is given up, and all its ordinances, means, and helps have ceased; and hence the Deity is no longer accessible to sinful men. If mercy had been attainable with the lost, it would surely have been found while there was yet an Intercessor on the throne; and if an amelioration had been possible in the sinner's state, it would have been effected in the interval between death and judgment; but the last day finds them still impenitent; and when the Saviour vacates the mediatorial throne they are still accursed. Not only so, but the resurrection puts them into a new capacity for suffering. Some of them, like the rich man, will have endured the miseries of hell for hundreds, and others for thousands of years, before the day of judgment; but when that day comes it not only brings with it no relief from pain, no hope of future rescue, but it opens a new dispensation of wrath; it supplies the lost with additional capabilities of woe, and prepares them for that full infliction of vengeance which had been awaiting them to this hour. Being raised from the dead, they are vested with a nature incorruptible, immortal, and as capable of enduring endless torment, as the glorified saints and angels are of sustaining an exceeding great and eternal weight of glory. It is when thus qualified for another, an everlasting dispensation of wrath, that the sentence is uttered, 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire.'

It is vain to plead that such views are incompatible with the benevolence of the Divine character. Justice has its claims as well as mercy; and mercy despised is justly withdrawn. It is marvellous that the wretched culprit, convicted and condemned at the bar of justice, should be so sensitive respecting the character of his Judge. Better for him to spend his anxieties on his own condition, and by true repentance avert the wrath he deprecates, than trouble himself with foolish attempts to defend God's character by denying his truth. It is poor service to save God's benevolence by repudiating his faithfulness and making him a liar. Let no such irreverent hands touch the ark, lest they be smitten with Uzzah's fate, or receive the threatened malediction of the closing oracle, 'If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of

the book of life.' God is able to defend his character, and he will defend it, but not at the expense of truth, not in the compromise of his word. He knew what objections carnal reason would suggest, and yet he caused all the dreadful denunciations against the sinner, and all the awful threatenings of eternal misery, to be recorded in his word; and what he hath threatened he will perform. Moreover, the destiny of wicked men is not the event in which to look for a display of benevolence, but of punitive justice. We do not look to the scaffold for a manifestation of a sovereign's benignity, but rather to good laws, and to the happy homes of an obedient people. And we look to the state of the lost not for an exhibition of compassion, but of holiness exemplifying its repugnance to sin; and justice upholding law and order, and vindicating the claims of a righteous government. If we desire to see benevolence, we may behold it in the cross, in the provisions of pardon for the guilty, in forbearance with sinners, in tender entreaties and expostulations with erring men, in the happiness of the righteous, in the bliss of angels, and the joys of the glorified. Oh, yes, God is good, infinitely good, or his Son had not died. God is good, or he had not sworn by himself that he has no pleasure in the sinner's death; but he is absolutely holy, inflexibly just, and therefore sin shall not go unpunished; he is unchangeably true, and therefore his threatenings as well as his promises shall all be fulfilled. Blessed are they who, instead of cavilling at his word, thankfully embrace the offers of his mercy.

The same truth which imparts to hell its deepest gloom gives to heaven its brightest joy—it is eternal life. The happiness is secure, its duration is everlasting. No shorter period could satisfy the infinite benevolence of the Donor: nothing less could meet the requirements of an immortal nature. The anticipation of an end at any period, however remote, would cast a gloom upon the most joyous moments of heaven.

> 'Oh, ye blest scenes of permanent delight!
> Full above measure, lasting beyond bound!
> Could ye, so rich in rapture, fear an end,
> That ghastly thought would drink up all your joy,
> And quite unparadise the realms of bliss.'

But that thought can never enter there. No, the possibility is

excluded by the word of Him who hath said, 'I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish; neither shall any one pluck them out of my hand.' That comprehensive word *eternity*—how it baffles the human understanding! that which shuts out every hope from hell, excludes every apprehension from heaven, and makes the prospect bright and boundless through every succeeding age. We calculate ages, but they are nothing. We seek for analogies and comparisons, but we find them not. A unit is something compared to a million; one star is something compared to the countless aggregations that powder the midnight heavens; one drop of water is something compared to the vast oceans of the Atlantic and Pacific; one grain of dust is something to the incalculable millions of particles that compose the globe; but ages expressed in numbers that would exhaust the life of man in multiplying, are nothing, absolutely nothing, to eternity. Comparison there is none; proportion there is none. It is all contrast, mighty, overwhelming contrast, to any computation we can state or imagine. The mind is bewildered while it contemplates the ages of its own being. It is an existence—we feel a tremulous awe in uttering it—it is an existence which shall run on in duration coeval with the Deity himself; an existence blessed with unceasing advancement in the knowledge and enjoyment of the glorious Being who bestows it upon us; an existence in the bright and happy region of which it shall be for ever said, 'THE LORD IS THERE.'*

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

THE Sabbath is an institution of *Divine* origin and *permanent* obligation. The appropriation of one day in seven to rest from secular employment, and the consecration of that day to the solemn exercises of devotion and religion, is an ordinance coeval with the creation of man, and retains its force through all

* The Resurrection, as well as Judgment and Final Retribution, are argued at length in 'The Shekinah,' pp. 266—384.

the ages of time. Originating not in any *arbitrary appointment* or *temporary* purpose, but in the requirements of man's physical and spiritual nature, and in the duties he owes to God, it assumes a permanent character; it belongs to his *nature* as man, and his relation as a creature of God, under all the circumstances of his condition, while an inhabitant of the present world. This is the doctrine we propose to defend and establish.

Our arguments will be comprised in the following propositions:—

I. The ordinance of the Sabbath, or the appropriation of one day in seven to rest and religion, is an original institution, and was ordained at the creation of man.

II. The Sabbath, when re-enacted on mount Sinai, was not enjoined as a temporary institute, but as a *moral* duty.

III. The Saviour expressly teaches us that the Sabbath was made, not for any particular nation, but for *man*. It therefore belongs to human nature in every age, and in every nation upon earth.

IV. The Sabbath, though a moral duty, is typical of heaven, and must be in force until its antitype is come—until this earthly probation is exchanged for our heavenly inheritance.

It will at once be seen that the establishing of these propositions will prove the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath. This being done, we shall then show that the transfer of the Sabbath to the first day of the week is of Divine appointment. We proceed, then, to prove that—

I. *The Sabbath, as a day appropriated to rest and religious duties, is an original institution, coeval with the existence of man.* When Jehovah had finished the wondrous work of creation, he looked with complacency upon the objects he had made, and pronounced them very good. It was then the Sabbath was ordained, as a memorial of creative wisdom, power, and goodness. 'And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day. Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had

rested from all his work which God created and made.'—Gen. i. 31; ii. 1—3. Thus, the Sabbath dates its origin from the completion of creation, and was designed to commemorate that great event. God made all things for his own glory; the intelligent creature, man, was formed capable of beholding that glory, and the first day after his creation was set apart for communion with the Being who had given him life. The first rotation of the earth, after its garniture was completed, and man, its noblest inhabitant and lord, was placed upon its surface, ushered in the light of the Sabbath. This was the day God '*sanctified*'—distinguished it from all the rest, set it apart from all secular objects and pursuits, and devoted it to rest and religion. This was the day which God '*blessed*'—pronounced it blessed, and honoured as the day when his spiritual blessings should be copiously bestowed upon man. On this memorable day 'the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.' The legions of heaven looked upon the new-born universe with rapture, and celebrated the glory of the Creator; and it was intended that man should be incited and moved to the same hallowed employment, and thus the whole intelligent universe conspire to praise and magnify him 'who spake, and it was done: who commanded, and it stood fast.'

Seeing, then, the Sabbath was enjoined upon man in paradise, it is not a mere *Jewish* institution; since it was commanded from the foundation of the world, it is not a temporary ordinance, but one which is founded partly upon the mental and physical constitution of human nature, and partly upon our relationship to God, as his creatures. It is an original institution, as ancient as the law of love itself, and is intended to remain in force until mortality is swallowed up of life—until the earthly Sabbath gives place to the perpetual and uninterrupted rest of the heavenly world.

It has been alleged by objectors to the Sabbath, that when Moses connected the Sabbath with his account of the creation, in Gen. ii., he spoke *proleptically*, or by anticipation. In other words, that the Sabbath was *first* ordained at the giving of the law, and that Moses, in speaking of it in Gen. ii. 1, 2, is only mentioning then an institution which was *afterwards* ordained. But this supposition is most unwarrantable, and is plainly con-

tradicted by Scriptural statements and facts. It is true that the Sabbath was commanded from Mount Sinai, but this no more implies that it was a *new* ordinance, than the injunction of the other nine commandments implies that they were new. The duty of refraining from idolatry, enjoined in the first precept, and the duty of revering the name of God, enjoined in the third precept, were not *new* duties, but original; and equally so was the duty of keeping the Sabbath. It was *first* enjoined in Paradise, but was re-enacted on Sinai.

Every view we take of the duty shows it to be original, and coeval with the creation. The phraseology in which the precept is introduced in the law affords, at least, a presumptive argument of this. It is commanded, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' To *remember* either a truth or a duty implies a *previous* knowledge of it; and if the Sabbath were *previously* known, it was not a *new* institution, but one with which the people were already familiar. Besides, facts clearly prove that the Sabbath was both known and obeyed as a Divine institution *prior* to the giving of the law. Before the people of Israel came to Sinai, the miraculous supply of manna was afforded, and on this occasion the Sabbath was spoken of as an institution already well known by the Israelites. 'And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord. . . Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none. And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?'—Exod. xvi. 22, 23, 26—28. The facts before us are these:—*First*, that the Sabbath is here spoken of as being a day holy to the Lord; *secondly*, that the injunction to keep it holy is called God's commandment and law; and *thirdly*, that Divine Providence miraculously concurs to sanction and enforce obedience to the Divine precept, by giving a double supply of manna on the sixth day, and by wholly withholding it on the seventh day. These facts occurring prior to the giving of the law,

prove that the Sabbath was previously a well-known institution.

Moreover, the reasons stated for the observance of the Sabbath are such as show it to have been a primeval institution. In the fourth commandment it is stated, as the reason for man's observance of it, that 'in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.'—Exod. xx. 11. Here the institution of the Sabbath is plainly connected with the completion of creation. Its appointment was not an after-thought, or a subsequent event, but one which was coeval with creation itself. It is expressly stated that the day on which God rested was the day which he sanctified and blessed as the Sabbath. We have to ask, then, which day was that? Did he rest on the day *immediately* after he had completed his work? or did he not rest until the law was given on Sinai, two thousand three hundred years after he had finished his work? The answer which reason is compelled to give shows the palpable absurdity of the notion, that the Sabbath was a Jewish institution. As the day when God rested from his work of creation was the day he sanctified and blessed as the Sabbath, it follows that the Sabbath was an original institution, ordained as a duty and a privilege for man from the foundation of the world.

The original appointment of the Sabbath accounts for two facts—namely, the mention of weeks, and the division of time into periods of seven days, both in the early records of the patriarchal dispensation and amongst the most ancient heathen nations. Laban speaks to Jacob about a week, as a well-known period.—Gen. xxix. 27. Noah observed the period of *seven days* when he sent forth the dove from the ark.*

* The futile objection founded upon the fact that the Sabbath is not more frequently named in the book of Genesis is thus refuted by Dr Wardlaw:—'That no conclusion can be drawn from a consideration purely *negative*, against one which rests on grounds so palpable and positive, may be further shown—*first*, from the circumstance of *weeks* being, throughout the entire preceding history, a recognized division of time, corresponding, of course, to the *creation week* from which the division had its origin, and which consisted of *six days of work* and *one of rest*; so that every mention of weeks includes mention of the Sabbath; and *secondly*, from the fact of there being no mention of the Sabbath in the *subsequent* historical books of Scripture (those of Joshua and Judges)—

It is a remarkable fact that, in almost all nations, men have divided time into septenary periods, or periods of seven days. That this custom obtained amongst the ancient Celts and Indians we learn from Philostratus, Dion Cassius, and Justin Martyr. To these nations may be added the Assyrians, the Egyptians, the Arabians, the Grecians, the Italians, and ancient Britons. Indeed, Josephus says that 'there is not a city of the Grecians, nor any of the Barbarians, nor any nation whatsoever, whither our custom of resting on the seventh day hath not come.'* We have similar testimony in Philo, Tibullus, and Lucian.† One part of the general evidence before us is seen in the custom prevailing amongst *ourselves* of dividing time into periods of seven days. This custom is not of Christian origin, but existed in our land before the introduction of Christianity. The names we give to days are confined to seven; and those names themselves indicate a heathen origin, for they are the names of the false deities which our ignorant and superstitious ancestors adored. Sunday is the day named after the *Sun;* Monday is *Moonday;* Tuesday is the day devoted to the god *Tuisco;* Wednesday is the day sacred to the god *Woden;* Thursday the day in honour of the deity *Thor;* Friday is the day sacred to the goddess *Friga;* and Saturday the day devoted to the god *Seater*, or Saturn.

That the heathens, while observing a septenary division of time, regarded the seventh day as more sacred than the rest is evident from several passages of the Greek poets quoted by Aristobulus, a learned Jew, by Clement of Alexandria, and Eusebius:—

—— εβδομη ιερον ημαρ:
The seventh, the *sacred* day.

for a period of at least 400 years after its admitted institution in the wilderness —and of the extremely rare and incidental notice of it for even a greater number of centuries posterior to the close of the book of Judges; and from the further parallel facts of there being no mention, for a period of 1500 years—from the birth of Seth till the flood—of *sacrifice;* and for a similar period of 1500 years —from the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan till the birth of Christ—of *circumcision* as an existing rite, unless in an occasional and figurative use of the word by the historians and prophets. In none of the cases is such silence conclusive; and in the case of the Sabbath, the objection from the silence before is completely neutralized by the silence after.'

* 'Joseph. against Apion,' book ii. † Grotius, 'De Verit. Religionis.'

Εβδοματη δ' επειτα κατηλυθεν, ιερον ημαρ :
Afterwards came the seventh, the *sacred* day.
Again :—
Εβδομον ημαρ ην, και τω τετελετο παντα :
On the *seventh* day all things were completed.*

Every custom must have had some origin, and where that custom is *universal* it must have had a *common* origin. We therefore ask—From what cause is it that all nations, however remote from each other, however diverse in language and manners, should agree in the mode of computing *time* by the period of seven days? It cannot arise from any arithmetical reason, for nations compute all other things by *tens*, not by *sevens*.† It cannot arise from any philosophical reason, for there is nothing in Nature which could suggest to the mind of man the idea of reckoning time by the period of seven days. It does not correspond to the periodical revolution of any object. The reckoning of time by years is natural, for it is the period of the earth's revolution in her orbit. The period of a month is natural, for it approximates to the revolution of the moon in her orbit round the earth; and the period of a day is natural, for it is the time of the earth's rotation on her axis; but the period of a *week* is not in accordance with any known periodical phenomenon. It is therefore impossible to assign this custom to any human origin. But the Scriptures plainly give us the origin. It was ordained at the creation; and when mankind were dispersed into all parts of the world shortly after the deluge, they carried with them the custom which had obtained from the beginning; and, amid all the mutations of time, all the desolations of war, and all the superstitions which have corrupted religion, this ancient custom has survived, and presents a collateral evidence of the antiquity and divinity of the Sabbatical institution.

The objection, then, that the Sabbath is a Jewish institution, falls to the ground; for what belonged to man in Para-

* Grotius, 'De Ver. Religionis.' See also 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' vol. xix. p. 596.

† When infidel France attempted to abolish the Sabbath, she adopted a *decade* week (a week of ten days); and as such a mode corresponds with the computation of all other objects, it is probable that this would have been general amongst mankind, had not God himself instituted the division of time by the seventh day—Sabbath.

dise cannot be exclusively appropriate to one nation, but is the inheritance of mankind in general; and if the Sabbath be not merely a *Jewish* institution, it cannot have passed away with that temporary economy, but is still obligatory upon all nations. This conclusion is strengthened by our next proposition, namely—

II. *That the Sabbath, when re-enacted from Sinai, was not enjoined as a* TEMPORARY *institution, but as a* MORAL *duty.*

The code of the Jewish law contained in the Scriptures may be divided into three parts—the *Levitical*, or what related to the religious ceremonies of that dispensation; the *Civil*, or what referred to national politics and jurisprudence; and the *Moral*, or what related to moral duties. The two former were, in their nature, limited and temporary, obligatory only upon the Jews as a distinct people, and under their own peculiar dispensation. But moral duties belonged to them in *common with all mankind*—they were of universal and perpetual obligation. They belong to man, as man, as a creature of God, as a social being, existing in important relations to his fellow-men, and as a probationer for another world, as well as an inhabitant in this.

Now, the law of the Sabbath holds its place among the *moral* precepts. In the fourth commandment it is solemnly enjoined, 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.'—Exod. xx. 8—11. Thus, it is one of the ten commandments, engraven by the finger of God on tables of stone, and deposited in the ark of the covenant—all indicative of its permanent character and obligation. It is no more a *new* precept than any of the other nine precepts of the Decalogue; and it is no more a temporary institution than they are. As a *moral* precept, it is an original and universal duty, belonging to Gentile as well as Jew, to the Christian dispensation as well as the Levitical economy.

As a moral duty, the Sabbath is enjoined in numerous passages with the most solemn sanctions—death being pronounced against those who profaned that sacred day, and blessings promised to those who observed it. 'I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people.'—Exod. xxxi. 13, 14.

At a period when the Jewish dispensation was waxing old, and prophetic announcements gave clear intimations that it was approaching towards its termination, the *Sabbath* still retained all its importance and freshness. As a duty, it was enjoined with the same earnestness; the spirituality of its nature and requirements as a moral duty were explained and enforced, and the richest blessings were promised to those who observed it in sincerity and truth. 'Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice: for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil.' Here it is classed with moral duties. Again says God, by the same prophet, and in language still more impressive:—'If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.'—Isa. lvi. 1, 2; lviii. 13, 14. This passage plainly shows the true nature and spiritual design of the Sabbatic institution, and the blessedness of those who observe it. When a duty is shown to be coeval with the creation of the world, to be classed with the moral precepts of the Decalogue, to have respect not only to the rest of the body, but essentially to the sanctifying of the affections of the soul, we have a demonstration that it is properly a *moral* duty, not merely a ceremonial observance; and, as a moral duty, imperative and obligatory under all dispensations.

It may be proper here to consider a few special objections. Two passages in the writings of St Paul have been alleged against the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath. In Rom. xiv. 5, 6, the Apostle says, 'One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day *alike*. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it.' In reference to this passage I observe: 1. The word '*alike*' is not in the original, and this is indicated by its being put in *italic* letters. Therefore the word ought not to have been inserted, as it is calculated to convey an idea never intended by the Holy Spirit. 2. The Apostle does not mention the word Sabbath in this passage, nor is there any evidence that he is making any allusion to it. But, 3. There were many *festive* days among the Jews, and the Apostle was referring to these as being no longer obligatory, for the whole Jewish ritual was done away by the fulness of the Gospel dispensation. The other passage is contained in Col. ii. 16, where the Apostle says, 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath *days*.' On this passage I observe—1. The Apostle is here plainly referring to *ceremonies*, not moral duties. This is evident from the terms he employs; hence he speaks of 'meats, drinks, new moons, holy days,' &c.; and these he comprehends under the general term of the 'handwriting of ordinances.' The handwriting, too, he says, was blotted out. But no law of the ten commandments is blotted out, or ever will be. Every *moral* law must perpetually remain in force. 2. He expressly designates these *ordinances* 'a shadow of things to come.' But the precepts of the Decalogue are not shadows of the Christian dispensation, but moral duties, perpetually obligatory. 3. The word *σαββάτων, sabbaths*, is in the plural, and though the Jewish Sabbath is thus expressed in some places, yet that plural form more properly belongs to the Jewish festivals, which were many. For these reasons we conclude that there is no reference here to the seventh-day Sabbath. The reference is to Jewish festivals and ceremonies, which were temporary 'ordinances,' now 'blotted out'—transient shadows—adumbrations of better things to come—the body and the

substance of which is Christ. But the Sabbath was not a temporary ordinance; it was an original institution—not a Jewish ceremony, but a *moral* duty, and as such cannot be superseded or set aside. Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil and honour it.

It is alleged that the Saviour wrought miracles on the Sabbath day. True: but his wonderful deeds neither violated the Sabbath nor showed the least disrespect to its sanctity. The miracles he wrought were deeds of mercy, and these were never forbidden. The reply which the Redeemer gave to his accusers was designed to rebuke the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, but his language at the same time plainly recognized the sanctity of the Sabbath; for he said, 'It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days.'—Matt. xii. 12. Thus he taught them that *good works* and works of mercy might be performed on that sacred day, for such were in harmony with its sanctity; but observe, this permission did not extend to other works—to works of business, or pleasure. This limitation, then, in the words of our Lord, upholds the sanctity of the Sabbath, and confirms our obligation to observe it as a day of rest from common labour, from worldly pleasure, and to devote it to the service of God and the good of our fellow-men.

It is further objected, that our Lord has summed up the requirements of the law in the principle of love, and taught us that love to God and man is the fulfilling of the whole law—therefore, the ordinance of the Sabbath is no longer obligatory. It is true our Lord comprehends the whole law in the principle of love, but he never designed that love should supersede obedience, or that a holy principle in the heart should set aside holiness in the life. On the contrary, he says, 'If ye love me, keep my commandments.' Love is the principle and spring of obedience, and without this no external observances are acceptable to God; but moral duties are still obligatory, and their performance is the *necessary* fruit of love, and a genuine evidence of its existence in the heart. Love to God no more sets aside the obligation of the Sabbath than it does any other moral duty. Apply the principle of the objector to other precepts of the law and its absurdity will be at once apparent. Take, for example, the second commandment: does love to God neutralize the duty of abstaining from idolatry? Take the eighth commandment:

does love to God set aside the duty of refraining from stealing? Take any of the rest, and ask the same question. If, then, the principle of love leaves the other commandments of the law in force, it leaves the fourth commandment, in its spirit and design, in full force also; and the Gospel, so far from making void the law through faith, establishes the law—unfolds more clearly its spiritual nature, enforces its obligations, and promotes obedience to its requirements. Thus it appears that the objections of our opponents, when examined by the test of Scripture, furnish additional evidence of the truth of the principles we maintain. If a man love God he will keep his commandments; and this is one of his commands—'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.' We proceed in our argument to show—

III. *That the Saviour has expressly taught that 'The Sabbath was made for man;' not for man in any particular nation or age, but without limitation; and, therefore, it is of universal and perpetual obligation.*

'And he said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.'—Mark ii. 27. There are several interesting views to be taken of this passage. The Sabbath was ordained '*for man*,' as a *duty* incumbent upon him; '*for man*,' as a *privilege* conferred upon him; '*for man*,' being ordained after man's creation, and therefore subordinated to his interests and welfare. But one important fact which stands prominent is that expressed in our third general proposition—namely, that it was made for *all men* without distinction. In this passage the Sabbath stands broadly distinguished from any institution of a merely ceremonial or temporary character and design. The Levitical law was not made for man in general, but for one particular nation—a distinct and peculiar people, the descendants of Abraham—and was never designed to be obligatory upon all nations. The Levitical law was designed to be temporary also in its duration. In its extent it was confined to the Hebrew nation, and in its duration was limited to the Jewish dispensation. But the Sabbath was not made merely for the Hebrew nation, but for *man* without distinction or restriction —it was not made for any limited period of time, but for *man* in all ages. The facts of the case establish the doctrine, for we find the Sabbath existing in all ages. When man was embow-

ered in Paradise, when he lived in innocence and happiness, the Sabbath was his privilege. When he had fallen into sin, it was graciously continued; and traces of its existence in the patriarchal ages have already been noticed. Before the children of Israel had arrived at Sinai, it was recognized as an existing institution. When the precepts of the moral law were re-enacted, it was placed in the *centre* of the Decalogue. During the whole Jewish dispensation it continued in force, and contemporaneously was known among all nations; and now the Levitical economy is abolished, it continues a moral law, binding upon the conscience of the Christian in all parts of the world.

'The Sabbath was made for man,' as a *duty* incumbent upon him. The duties man owes to God arise from his relation to him. God is his Creator and Sovereign. From him man derives his existence, and to him he is accountable for his conduct. God has a right to dispose of man's time, to direct its appropriation, and require any portion he pleases to be devoted exclusively to himself. We have seen that from the beginning God commanded the *seventh* portion to be thus specially set apart for himself, and devoted to religion. Hence the duty is incumbent upon *all* men, because *all* stand in the same relation to God. The duty is common, because the relation is universal. *All* are God's creatures, and owe this duty in submission to his will, and in acknowledgment of his sovereign authority. From the beginning, therefore, this duty belonged to man, and for the same reason *must* retain its obligation to the end of time.

'The Sabbath was made for man' as a *privilege* conferred upon him. Viewed in this interesting light it has respect both to man's physical and spiritual nature, to the interests of time and eternity.

Man's nature requires periodical intervals of rest and relaxation. Light as was the labour of man when his chief employment was to dress and keep the garden of Eden, a seventh-day's rest was even then congenial to his condition; but since man has fallen and been doomed to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, this merciful provision is indispensable to his bodily health and welfare. Toil, such as the majority of men are now doomed to undergo, if unrelieved by the Sabbatic rest, would render existence a burden, break down the constitution, deteri-

orate the human species, and abridge the duration of human life. Cupidity often makes man his *own* oppressor; avarice and tyranny induce him to oppress his fellow-men; and without the restrictions and limitations which Divine authority has imposed by the Sabbatic rest, still more degraded and enslaved would have been the condition of mankind. The institution of the Sabbath, therefore, is God's merciful restraint upon human cupidity, and his powerful protection to the weak and the poor against the exactions of avarice and oppression. How preposterous to suppose that this merciful institution was intended only for the Jew! Is the Jew alone subject to labour, liable to exhaustion, or exposed to oppression? or does God care only for the Jew? We rejoice to know, from the express declaration of the Saviour, that the Sabbath was made for *man*. It is a blessed privilege, which is the birthright of every man that breathes. Every Sabbath sun ushers in the day of welcome rest to the sons of labour and business, and gives them the warrant of Divine authority to enjoy that refreshing intermission from the toils and anxieties of life, which their exhausted nature requires. An institution so wise, humane, and benevolent, argues its divine origin. While God's authority prescribes the duty, his bounty provides for man's necessities, and provides so amply that the six days' labour is abundantly sufficient to secure for man a supply for all his need. His laws for man's conduct, and his benevolent provision for man's welfare, harmonize together, and both are equally worthy of his character as our God, who is 'good to all, and whose tender mercies are over all his works.' His regard for the labouring beast is also manifest in this merciful institution.

'The Sabbath was made for man' as a privilege in favour of his *spiritual* interests. When God created the body of man out of the dust of the earth, he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul, and was made in the image of God. The soul has interests of its own, apart from those of the body, and they are promoted by a distinct class of exercises, such as prayer, praise, meditation, and holy affections. It was, therefore, requisite that some portion of our time should be allotted *specially* for these holy exercises and important interests. God has determined that portion to be the seventh part of our existence. The wisdom of assigning

such a portion of our time is very apparent. The labours necessary to provide for the numerous wants of the body require the portion assigned thereto; and since the exercises of devotion can be pursued to some extent in connection with earthly engagements, and during the intervals of those engagements, the appropriation of one day in seven exclusively to religious purposes, will be found adequate to our spiritual interests in the present life. This distribution of our time evinces that God, from the beginning, had a benevolent regard to the welfare of both body and soul, to the whole interests of human nature, whether they relate to the introductory and transient state of man's existence, or to that solemn eternity for which he is destined.

Viewed in this respect, the Sabbath was obviously made for '*man*'—for man *originally*, and for man *universally*. For every human being has these spiritual interests to secure, these sacred duties to perform, and requires these periodical opportunities to perform the one and secure the other. When man lived in Paradise, a stranger to the guilt and curse of sin, the Sabbath was necessary to his spiritual interests. It was a perpetual monument of the epoch when creation was completed, a memorial of the wisdom, power, and glory of the Creator. Its frequent recurrence reminded man of his relation to God, of his spiritual nature, of the eternal interests he had to secure, of the duties he owed to his Maker; it invited him to the most refined and elevated reflections, the highest aspirations of devotion, and the most intimate communion with God.

If thus a *privilege* to man in the period of his innocence, how much more so in the period of his degeneracy, and in a state of society when men are so prone to earthly-mindedness? If needful to keep alive the devotional spirit in man, and sustain an elevated tone of holy and heavenly affection in Paradise, how much more so amid the thronged and busy scenes of trade and commerce, the secularizing influence of earthly cares, the snares of sensual pleasure, and the corrupt example of worldly men? With all the advantages of the Sabbath, man is too apt to forget his Maker, and lose sight of his spiritual and eternal interests; but what would he be were the Sabbath abolished? With all the influences this holy day presents to refresh man's memory of his duty, to stimulate his conscience as to his re-

sponsibilities, and excite his affections towards God and heavenly objects, how vast the masses who live like heathens! how often the spirit of piety decays in the hearts of professing Christians! and how absorbing the influence of earth's momentary trifles, both in the Church and in the world! But who can estimate the amount of practical indifference and ungodliness, the speculative infidelity and contempt of God, the gross licentiousness and sensuality which would everywhere abound, if there were no holy day of rest to exert its instructive, admonitory, restraining, and purifying influences upon the minds and habits of mankind? Would not earth become a counterpart of hell itself? Would not man totally forget his Maker, and his own immortality? and the torrent of impiety swell, until profaneness, lewdness, oppression, and violence again fill the earth as it did before the deluge, when God's wrath swept them all away?

The Sabbath is therefore necessary for man's spiritual and eternal welfare, and in regard to that welfare God has ordained it. This fact involves the conclusion that it was made for *man* universally, for Jew and Gentile, bond and free, for all men. All have the same spiritual duties to perform, the same eternal interests to secure, the same antagonistic influences to resist; and for all the same blessed privilege was designed. Such views of its nature are fatal to the notion that the Sabbath is merely a Jewish ceremony.

IV. *To the arguments already adduced, another may be briefly stated—namely, the Sabbatic rest on earth is a type of heaven.* The Apostle says, 'For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works. And in this place again, If they shall enter into my REST.' In the ninth verse he says, 'There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God.'—Heb. iv. 4, 5, 9. Now, in looking at these passages, three things strike our attention. 1. That the Apostle speaks of the Sabbath as a typical representation of a state of eternal rest; and 2. that in conformity with this, when speaking of heaven in the ninth verse, the word rendered *rest* is σαββατισμὸς, a *Sabbatism*, or the keeping of a *Sabbath*. 3. He speaks of Christ having gone, as our head, to take possession of this rest; 'For he that is entered into his rest, he also (even Jesus Christ) hath ceased

from his own work, as God did from his.' There must be force and propriety in this comparison. God never speaks but to instruct his creatures; nor ever employs similitudes and comparisons but such as are appropriate and expressive. If the earthly Sabbath, then, be a typical representation of the pure, the refined, the spiritual, and uninterrupted joys of heaven, it follows, that the type retains its *use* and obligation until the antitype shall come. This is the essential character of *all* types. The sacrifices of the Jewish law were in force until the sacrificial death of their great antitype. The Jewish ritual was in force until, at the dying groan of the Saviour, the vail of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom. Then the design of the Levitical institution was answered, and its code abolished. Christ was the end of that law for righteousness to every one that believeth. But the Sabbath was, from the first, a *moral* duty. Its use as a means of spiritual improvement continues, and its design as a typical institution must remain until it gives place to the eternal Sabbath—the rest that remains to the people of God.

Such is a brief view of the Scriptural evidence respecting the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath. But it is demanded —By what arguments do you justify the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week? This inquiry we shall now answer.

It is to be well observed, however, that this inquiry is supposed to proceed from one who acknowledges the perpetual obligation of a Sabbath, otherwise it is out of place, for this question is quite distinct in itself. If a man object *in toto* to the Sabbatical institution, the answer is already furnished in our preceding arguments. It is therefore only on the supposition that he admit those arguments to be conclusive, that he can consistently require our reason for the change of the day. In this form, then, the question presents itself:—'It being evident, that the observance of one day in seven, as a day devoted to rest and religious duties, is of universal and perpetual obligation, why is the Sabbath, which was on the seventh day under former dispensations, transferred to the first day of the week under the Christian economy?' To this we reply—

1. The essential character, use, and design of the Sabbath is not affected by the mere circumstance of the day on which

the Sabbath is held, whether it be the last or the first day of the week. Had it been a change from one day in seven to one day in ten or twenty, then the change would have been material; or had it been a change from religious duties to the pursuits of literature or science, then the change would have been material, and its character and object would have been destroyed. But the change from the seventh to the first day leaves it unaltered in its nature, and unimpaired in its object. The *proportion* of time is the same as it was when first ordained at the creation—it is still one day in seven. Its *use* is the same: a day of rest from physical toil, from worldly pleasure, and of consecration to religious duties. Its *design* is the same: to counteract the influence of secular pursuits, and to promote the spirituality and holiness of mankind; and all these objects are as effectually promoted by the observance of the first as of the seventh day of the week.

As a proof that the mere circumstance of time *when* the Sabbath is held does not essentially affect its nature and object, it may be observed that the geographical position of different parts of the world, producing a difference in the time of the sun's rising and setting, renders it impossible to observe uniformity of time throughout the world. If, therefore, the nature and object of the Sabbath admit a variety in the time of its celebration, in adaptation to the different longitudes men may occupy, so its nature and object may admit a change in the time of its celebration, for the high *moral* and spiritual reasons presented in the economy of redemption. In this respect the Sabbath was made for man; made subordinate to his best interests. The change was effected by Providence, in accommodation to man's welfare.

2. If God saw fit to change the day, he has an undisputed right to do so. It was by his authority alone that the day was originally appointed; and the same authority which fixed the period of one day at the first, has both the power and the right to transfer it to another. Nor is there in this change any infringement on the truth and holiness of his character. Nor is there any impeachment of his wisdom or immutability. It is rather an evidence of his wisdom, as we shall shortly see; and, as he knew the event from the beginning, and designed it, his immutability stands unaffected.

¶ 3. In the economy of redemption, there are more powerful reasons presented for transferring the Sabbatic rest to the first day of the week than there are for continuing it on the last day of the week. The work of creation is glorious, but the work of redemption hath a surpassing glory—

> 'Twas great to speak a world from nought,
> 'Twas greater to redeem.'

The former presents a magnificent display of the natural attributes of the Deity; but the latter presents a magnificent display of both his natural attributes and his *moral perfections*—his holiness, justice, truth, and mercy, as well as his wisdom, benevolence, and power. At the birth of the universe, the angels shouted for joy; but at the birth of the Saviour, they sung *glory to God in the highest*. There is no event in the annals of eternity equal to the redemption of mankind by Jesus Christ; and, as this event was completed on the *first* day of the week, when the Saviour rose from the dead, it was consonant with the wisdom of God to signalize the more glorious event, by transferring the Sabbatic rest to that day when Redemption's great work was completed.

4. The resurrection of the Saviour rendered the religious exercises of the Sabbath more appropriate to the first than the last day of the week. The Sabbath was designed to be a day of joy, but on the seventh day the Saviour was lying in the tomb, at which time the joy of the Sabbath would have been most inappropriate. Fasting and sorrow were more consonant to such a mournful occasion; as the Redeemer himself had said, 'The days will come when the Bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days.' Now had the Sabbath remained unchanged, the day of highest joy would have been held by the Church on the day when the Bridegroom was taken away—the day when fasting was more becoming. But, when the Redeemer burst the bonds of death and rose as a mighty conqueror from the tomb, there was terror in hell, joy in heaven, and occasion for loudest exultation through the Church of God during all ages. As this glorious event occurred on the first day of the week, the transfer of the Sabbatic rest to that day was in harmony both with the event itself, and the joy which the Sabbath was originally designed to inspire.

5. The Sabbath was originally designed also for religious meditation, with a view to spiritual improvement. Of course, to this end the mind should be occupied with the contemplation of events the most calculated to promote that improvement—to elevate the affections, to purify the heart. The work of God in creation is a subject adapted for this, but still more so the glorious work of redemption. The first day of the week commemorates this work, and has therefore associations more calculated to minister to our spiritual welfare. As two days in the week cannot be devoted to this holy exercise, and as the adoption of the first is more agreeable with the nature and objects of the Sabbath, it was consonant with Divine wisdom to choose this day, and to comprehend in it the commemoration of both creation and redemption.

6. *God has chosen this day as the period for the Christian Sabbath, and this we proceed to prove.*

(*a*) The history of the Christian Sabbath plainly shows that the change of the day had no human origin. Had the religious observance of the Lord's day been of *human* origin, it would not have been universal in the ancient Church, but, like all human customs and usages adopted voluntarily, would have prevailed *partially*—some churches adhering to the practice, and others denouncing it as a human invention. But in the ancient Church it was universally acknowledged as the day of holy convocation and religious worship. Although some ancient Christians, in accommodation to the Jews by whom they were surrounded, observed the seventh day, they observed the Lord's day as well, as an institution of apostolic appointment. It is impossible to conceive how any human institution could have had the universal sanction and adoption of the Church. Nothing but Divine authority could have secured its universal adoption from the earliest ages of the Church.

(*b*) Had the Christian Sabbath been of human origin, it must have been derived from the decree of some council, or the mandate of some potentate; but it existed in the Church before any council sat, or any Christian potentate existed. Again, had it been of human origin, there would have been a period in the history of the ancient Church when it was not recognized, and its *commencement* would be recorded; but in the annals of the Church there is no such event recorded. On

the contrary, the ordinance of the Christian Sabbath is broadly marked through all ages, as an institution of universal prevalence in the churches, up to the time of the apostles themselves. The institution has clearly no human origin, and therefore its origin must be Divine.

(*c*) The deductions of reason on this subject are established by the testimony of Scripture. The New Testament plainly shows that the change of the day had a *Divine* origin. The first day of the week was the time when the apostles and first Christians met together for religious worship. In Acts xx. 6, 7, we read that Paul came to Troas, where he abode seven days. 'And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.' Now, here we see that although Paul remained at Troas for *seven* days, it was not on the *seventh* day (the time for the Jewish Sabbath), but on the *first* day of the week (the Christian Sabbath), that he met for worship with the whole Church: for it was *then* the disciples came together to worship and break bread. Their breaking of bread included both the Ἀγάπαι, or *Love-feasts*, and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and their other acts of devotion were performed at the same time. From another passage we learn that on this day the first Christians presented oblations of piety and charity. Hence, St Paul directs the members of the Corinthian Church —'Upon the first day of the week (the Christian Sabbath) let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.'—1 Cor. xvi. 2. We have thus the recognition and origin of our present practice—one day's rest and six days' labour, and that day of rest on the Lord's day—the first, and not the seventh, day of the week. On this day, too, the saints met for religious worship and the consecration of themselves and their property to God. What day could be so appropriate for such an expression of gratitude as the Lord's day, the day on which they commemorated the Redeemer's resurrection, and enjoyed the holy ordinances of religion? The sacrifices of the hand, in devoting their worldly substance, were thus united with the sacrifices of the heart, in presenting the tribute of holy affections to God their Saviour.

(*d*) The Apostle John says, 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.'—Rev. i. 10. From this passage it appears—1. That this day was consecrated to Christ as *his* day. 2. That this day was devoted to holy and religious exercises—St John was *in the Spirit* on this day. 3. That this day received a special designation appropriate to its sacred character—it was called '*the Lord's day*.' 4. This designation was so common, even in that early period of the Church, as to be generally known. 5. This name was applied to it by *Divine authority*—for it was applied to it by an inspired apostle writing expressly for the instruction of the churches, speaking in God's name, and delivering his solemn messages to mankind. It was the Lord's day.

(*e*) The example and authority of the apostles in this respect have the force of a positive injunction, for God teaches men by *example* as well as precept, by *narrative* as well as by didactic statement. The apostles were qualified for giving this instruction. They were endued with plenary inspiration to complete the Christian revelation, and they were invested with authority from heaven for this purpose.—John xiv. 26; xv. 26, 27; xvi. 7—15; Acts i. 8; Gal. i. 11, 12. It was under this inspiration and authority they taught the churches to appropriate the *first* day of the week to holy and religious purposes, and gave to that day its sacred designation, '*The Lord's day*.' This fact, then, identifies the Christian Sabbath as a *Divine* institution, and makes it of imperative obligation upon mankind, especially upon all who bear the Christian name.

(*f*) The designation which the New Testament gives to the Christian Sabbath, when viewed in connection with the words of Christ, presents additional evidence of the truth we maintain. The Saviour declared that he was '*Lord of the Sabbath*,' and an inspired writer tells us that the Christian Sabbath is '*the Lord's day*.' When these passages are viewed in connection, they furnish a demonstration of the obligation of the Christian Sabbath, such as ought to convince every one who has any respect to the authority of Scripture. In the Old Testament God claimed the Jewish Sabbath as his own. '*Ye shall keep my Sabbaths*, and reverence my sanctuary: I am the Lord.'—Lev. xix. 30. 'Ye shall fear every man his mother, and his father, *and keep my Sabbaths*: I am the Lord your

God.'—Verse 3. In the New Testament he calls the Chris tian Sabbath his own—it is '*the Lord's day*.' Thus, he wh was Lord of the Jewish Sabbath is Lord also of the Chris tian Sabbath, and, as its Lord, he claims it for his service, and requires it to be devoted to his glory. Though the time o holding it is changed, it is the same in its holy spiritual objects and is impressed with the sanction of the same Divine au thority—the authority of its Lord.

(*g*) This application of the term, '*the Lord's day*,' i strongly corroborated by another passage, in which the same adjective is used, in reference to the institution ordained t commemorate the Saviour's death. Paul, speaking of thi sacred ordinance, calls it Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, '*the Lord's supper*. —1 Cor. xi. 20. We have here the same adjective, κυριακὸ applied to the noun '*supper*,' as we have applied to the nou '*day*,' in Rev. i. 10. We have, then, to ask, what is the mean ing of the Apostle in the phrase, '*the Lord's Supper?*' Doe he mean any supper or meal of which we may partake with religious state of mind? Or does he mean the Supper whic our Lord appointed in commemoration of his own death—a supper which is emphatically a religious ordinance—in whic we eat the bread and drink the wine in remembrance of Him self—a supper which is sacredly, religiously, and exclusively devoted to Himself? The context furnishes the answer. W contend, then, that if such be the meaning of '*the Lord's sup per*,' such also is the meaning of '*the Lord's day*.' With a identity of terms we have an identity of meaning. If th adjective κυριακὸν, applied to δεῖπνον, *supper*, fixes its characte as a sacred institution, devoted to the Lord, so the same ad jective, applied to ἡμέρα, *day*, fixes its meaning as the sacre day devoted to the Lord, separated from the rest, and fro secular pursuits, and sanctified to the worship of that gloriou Being—the Lord—from whom it receives its designation.

It is remarkable that, as God sanctified and blessed th seventh day on its appointment, so when his providence change the time to the first day of the week, he signalized and hon oured that day by causing the most memorable and gloriou events to occur upon it. On this day the Saviour rose fro the sepulchre, spoiled principalities and powers, and made show of them openly, triumphing over them in it; thus showin

that redemption's work was completed, and giving to his Church the pledge of a glorious resurrection, and of an eternal Sabbath in heaven. On this day he *often* showed himself to his disciples after his resurrection. On this day a new and glorious dispensation was inaugurated—the DISPENSATION OF THE HOLY GHOST. On this day the commission of the apostles was opened, and the first-fruits of the Gospel harvest were reaped, in the conversion of three thousand souls. Thus he sanctified, honoured, and blessed the Christian Sabbath, shedding upon it his richest influence, his choicest blessings, and calling it his own day.

SUMMARY.—In proof of the Sabbath's *perpetuity* we have seen that it is not a temporary, but an *original* institution, established immediately after the creation of man; that it is a *moral* duty, and holds its place in the ten commandments of the law, which never have and never can be repealed; that, further, it is declared by our Saviour to have been ordained for *man;* that is, for human nature, in all ages and under all circumstances; involving a *duty* which *all* men are equally bound to perform, and including a *privilege* which *all* men have a right to enjoy. And finally, we have shown that the Sabbath, as typical of heaven, must remain in force until the antitype is come, until man leaves this region of toil and probation for the region of eternal rest and blessedness. In proof of the Scriptural authority of the change to the first day of the week, we have shown that while this change involved no compromise of principle in the nature and object of the Sabbath, it was in accordance with God's nature and his prerogative, as the author of the Sabbath, to change the day, if he thought proper to do so; that there were important reasons why God should change the day. And that he has done so we have shown from the facts of the case—namely, that the institution has existed through all ages of the Christian era up to apostolic times; that the apostles themselves, by their example and instructions, appointed this as the day for religious worship and deeds of charity; that He who was Lord of the Sabbath called *this* his own day; that, as *His* day, we are bound to keep it holy; that the Apostle John, even in solitude, was in the Spirit on this day; that as God sanctified and blessed the seventh day, so has he sanctified and blessed the first day of the week: and

to these arguments we may add that it was typified as the Christian Sabbath by the most solemn days of the Jewish annual festivals, which were always held, as by prophetic anticipation, on the same day as the Lord's day. Unless the mind be strangely perverted by prejudice, or be allied to unbelief and sin, the evidence before us must command our assent and secure our cheerful obedience.

Those who reject the Divine authority of the Sabbath generally concede its *expediency*. If the Sabbath be expedient it implies that the human judgment pronounces it a *wise*, *proper*, *benevolent*, and *beneficial* institution. Thus the voice of reason concurs with the injunctions of revelation. The one confesses its propriety, the other invests it with Divine authority. The one recommends, but the other commands and requires its observance. We may respect the decisions of reason but we *must* bow in submissive homage and cheerful obedience to the will and authority of God.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

The Christian ministry is an institution of Divine appointment, ordained for expounding, defending, and propagating the glorious Gospel, that the Church may be instructed and built up in the truth, and that sinners may be converted to God. The great Head of the Church has ordained 'some apostles and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.'—Eph. iv. 11, 12. This passage at once recognizes the ministry as a Divine institution, and as one embracing various important functions. It is undoubtedly the most important office which God has assigned to man, embracing duties the most sacred and spiritual and responsibilities the most solemn and weighty. A minister is a steward of the mysteries of God, and it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful. He is an ambassador for God, and has to negotiate with men in reference to their eter-

nal interests, and beseech them to be reconciled to God. He is a shepherd, and is required to feed the flock of God with knowledge and understanding. He is a watchman on the walls of Zion, and is required to sound an alarm at every point of danger—to watch for souls as one that must give account. He is required to preach the word; to be instant in season and out of season; to reprove, rebuke, and exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine.

Such being the nature and object of the Christian ministry, is it designed that this important office should he intrusted to men exclusively set apart to the work, or to men who connect with it a secular calling? The voice of reason replies, it is to be committed to neither exclusively, but to both conjointly. On the one hand, to appropriate the duties of the ministry solely to a class of men set apart to the work, would exclude a great amount of talent and efficient labour from a cause which demands all the Church can yield; and, on the other hand, to maintain that no men are to be wholly set apart to the ministry, would be to deny to Christianity those advantages which are ceded to other institutions of infinitely less importance. To the medical art men are exclusively devoted, and the common sense of mankind has pronounced it proper and even necessary to the public welfare. To the education of youth men are exclusively devoted, and the experience of all ages has determined its propriety. To the several branches of science, as well as to useful arts and occupations, men are entirely devoted, and it is found that this appropriation of human skill and effort, secures that concentration of mental energy which is most promotive of each department in the social economy, and most productive of general good. Indeed, the experience of mankind has found that every institution of any importance and magnitude must have its agents, whose time and labour must be wholly devoted to its particular interests. If this arrangement in the social economy be founded in wisdom, every reason which makes it so applies with far greater force, in favour of the principle of men being wholly devoted to the Christian ministry. No interests are so important as those of religion—none so universal; yet none have to contend with such counteracting agencies, and therefore none require more vigilance, more mental application, more devotedness and zeal. Its

sublime doctrines have to be illustrated and defended, its imperative duties enforced, its solemn interests advanced; and here are demands upon all the intellectual and moral power, all the assiduous and unbroken application, which can be consecrated to the interests of religion. Besides, it should ever be remembered that Christianity is essentially aggressive in its character, and the ministry is the agency through which its aggressive operations are to be conducted. It assails the ignorance, the prejudices, the inveterate depravity and wicked habits of mankind, and is destined to overcome them, and to transform this sinful and miserable world into a paradise of purity and blessedness. Yet this great result is to be accomplished, not by miracle, but by God's chosen agency—the ministry. 'Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God; but how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent?' Such is the connection between the ministry and man's salvation; and hence He who designs that salvation to be universal has given the command, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.'

Such, then, being the character and object of Christianity and such the appointed means of its diffusion, it is evident that all the consecrated talent, time, property, and effort the Church of God can furnish, are demanded to fulfil its glorious designs. But is this demand to be met by those fragments of time which men can spare from the busy occupations of life, or by those occasional efforts which nature can afford from a frame exhausted by toil? Are these abundantly sufficient for the triumphant advancement of religion through the earth? Is Christianity worthy of no more time and effort than the world can spare? Is its propagation of so little importance that it must depend solely upon the limited exertions of the laborious mechanic and the busy merchant? Is it possible the Christian can reason thus in the face of those Divine commands, 'Go into all the world;' 'preach the word; be instant in season and out of season'? It is plain that the great demands of the ministry are such as men immersed in secular pursuits are not in a position to perform, and therefore the theory which rejects the institution of the regular ministry, is inimical to the aggressive character of Christianity. It restricts and enfeebles the

efforts of the Church. It refuses to employ those means which common sense dictates as best adapted to give expansion to Christianity. It treats religion as less important than science, literature, and worldly business; and exhibits less consideration, wisdom, and liberality in promoting the kingdom of Christ, than it does in advancing the concerns of the world. Reason alone forces the conclusion, that the important interests of religion imperatively require that men of suitable qualifications should be set apart exclusively to its advancement. While Christianity not only welcomes but commands the energies of all to be employed in its diffusion, and admits even the sacred functions of the ministry to be performed by men of business, in proportion to their time and ability; yet its nature and objects require, in a far higher degree than any secular institution, that a multitude of devoted men should be set apart from all secular employment, and consecrated to the altar of God, devoting all their hours, talents, and strength in the work of the ministry. While, therefore, the notion that the functions of the ministry can be exercised by no person in a worldly station is an arrogant assumption, the notion that the institution of a regular ministry is anti-Christian, is irrational—either the offspring of ignorance respecting the true genius of religion, or of a morbid and selfish jealousy, which repines at the higher stations of usefulness and honour occupied by their fellow-men.

We have here the dictates of reason on this important subject; but, we ask, what are the declarations of Holy Scripture? Both in the Old and New Testament we find the institution of a regular ministry, requiring men to be *wholly* devoted to the interests of religion; but in connection with this institution, we find also the authorized recognition of men of secular station, employed in discharging the duties of the sacred office.

1. Under the Jewish dispensation, 'the Lord separated the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord; to stand before the Lord to minister unto him, and to bless in his name.' The descendants of Aaron were *specially* selected to offer sacrifices, and perform the more sacred duties of the sanctuary; but the whole tribe of Levi was set apart to the ordinary services of religion, and their support was exacted

from the people by Divine authority. Yet this separation of one tribe to the service of the sanctuary, did not exclude men of secular station from functions essentially connected with the ministry. The gift of special inspiration is as sacred as the privilege of presenting sacrifices, and the office of the prophet is as important and spiritual as that of the priest; yet inspiration was imparted to many who were not of the sacerdotal race, and the solemn burden of prophecy was delivered by many who had no inheritance with Levi. Jeremiah and Ezekiel, it is true, were prophets of the sacerdotal line; but David, Solomon, and probably Daniel and Isaiah, were of the tribe of Judah; and most, if not all the rest of the prophets, were unconnected with the priesthood. Nor were men of the humblest station excepted. Elisha was a husbandman, Amos a herdman, and others were men of humble condition. Nor were these men excluded from *occasionally* performing even those rites which peculiarly belonged to the priestly office. Samuel and Elijah offered sacrifices, Solomon presented public prayer at the dedication of the temple, and David sometimes put on the sacred ephod and inquired of the Lord. From the Old Testament, therefore, it is evident that the ministry, in its largest sense, comprehended both a class of men wholly devoted to the interests of religion, and others who held a secular occupation.

2. The testimony of the New Testament establishes the same principle. It clearly recognizes two classes of labourers in word and doctrine: one class, to whom the ministry was their proper calling, their whole life being devoted to its sacred duties; the other such as laboured occasionally in the ministry, connecting its duties with a secular occupation. The seventy disciples were ministers of the word, but there is no proof that they permanently relinquished their secular employment. On the persecution which arose about Stephen, many Christians were dispersed, and those who were scattered abroad travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word of God. There is no proof that any of these were either apostles or pastors, or that they were ever exclusively devoted to the work. Yet their labours were greatly blessed of God; for it is said, 'The hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord.'—Acts xi.

19—21. The Church at Antioch, it seems, was planted by the ministry of laymen, and that Church was eminently distinguished for its piety, its zeal, and all the fruits of holiness and usefulness. He who despises such agency, despises that on which God has fixed the seal of his approval, and which, in all ages, he has employed as one means to diffuse his truth and advance his glory.

At the same time it is evident that the apostles and others were separated from secular pursuits, and wholly devoted to the work of the ministry. When the Saviour selected the apostles for the ministry, it is remarkable that he at once summoned them away from their occupations. 'Walking by the Sea of Galilee, he saw two brethren, Simon and Andrew, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers. And he saith unto them, FOLLOW ME, and I will make you fishers of men. And they straightway left their nets, and followed him.'—Matt. iv. 18—20. Here was a renunciation of worldly business for a sacred calling—the occupation of fishing for that of saving immortal souls. Again, 'Jesus going on from thence, saw other two brethren, James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in a ship with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and he called them. And they immediately left the ship, and their father, and followed him.'—Matt. iv. 21, 22. Even business of a more public and important nature had to be relinquished at once when Jesus called a man to the ministry. He 'saw a publican, named Levi, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he said unto him, Follow me. And he left all, rose up, and followed him.'—Luke v. 27, 28. The most urgent offices and engagements were not to supersede or even to suspend the Redeemer's summons to the ministry. 'One of his disciples said unto him, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father; but Jesus said unto him, Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead.'—Matt. viii. 21, 22. These facts strikingly show the supreme importance of the ministerial office, and that separation from worldly pursuits, for the purpose of entire devotedness to its sacred duties, is an ordinance of Christ himself; while his peremptory mandate on the one hand, and the prompt obedience of his disciples on the other, are designed to show that no secular claims or engagements are to set aside or delay the duties of that holy calling.

After the death of Christ, the disciples, apparently not knowing that their separation from worldly business was to continue, but supposing it might be resumed, returned to their ships. 'Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing. They say unto him, We also go with thee. They went forth, and entered into a ship immediately; and that night they caught nothing.' At this time Jesus appeared, but it was to correct their mistake, to give them another proof of his power, to dismiss them finally from their secular employment, and renew their commission to preach the everlasting Gospel, as the sole object of their future life. By his miraculous interposition, a large draught of fishes is taken, evidently to intimate their success in the Gospel ministry. This being done, he tenderly appeals to Peter's love for him, and commands him, saying 'Feed my sheep; feed my lambs.'—John xxi. As if he had said, If thou lovest me, show it, by leaving thy boat and nets and henceforth devote thyself fully to the ministry; make that the sole end of thy existence. Subsequently, Christ gave to all the disciples the solemn charge, 'Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature;' and having given this command he was parted from them, and a cloud received him out of their sight. That the apostles understood their commission to imply such an entire consecration to the ministry as involved a renunciation of all worldly pursuits, is evident from Acts vi. The liberality of the brethren had furnished a treasury for the poor, but the apostles regarded the dispensing of these benevolent offerings as trespassing upon that time and attention, which ought to be appropriated to the peculiar functions of the ministry; hence, they called the multitude of the disciples *unto them*, and said, 'It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word.' Probably, these men took the office alternately, one for each day in the week.

Why was it not reasonable, or proper, that the apostles should take upon them the appropriation of the Church's charity? They were twelve in number, and, as yet, their labours were confined to Judea; why, then, could not some of

them be appointed to this work? or why could it not be performed by them alternately? The reason is obvious. Their Lord had called them to another work, a work more spiritual and sacred—the work of the ministry; and to its duties they were to be *wholly* devoted. The same reason which required them to leave their boats and nets, to abandon their worldly occupation altogether, required them to be exempt from the secular employments of the Church. The ministry was their work, and it demanded the unreserved consecration of their time, their talents, their life. Nor was this office confined to the apostles. The New Testament mentions Timothy, Titus, Silas, Barnabas, and other devoted men, whose lives, we have reason to believe, were wholly consecrated to the ministry. Paul addresses Timothy as one thus devoted to the sacred calling: 'Thou therefore, my son, endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life, that he may please him that hath chosen him to be a soldier.' Here is an allusion to a fact well understood. The legionary soldiers among the Romans, as Grotius observes, were not permitted to engage in husbandry, merchandise, mechanical employments, or anything that might be inconsistent with their calling. As Timothy, like the apostles, was chosen to be a soldier of Christ—that is, to be devoted to the ministry,—he was not to be entangled in secular business. He was to be as free from such engagements as the Roman soldier, that he might give attention to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine; that he might give himself wholly unto them, and continue in them; that he might make full proof of his ministry, be a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth; and that, while his profiting appeared unto all, he might save himself, and those who heard him.

3. If entire dedication to the ministry is an institution of Divine appointment, it follows, that to render support to the ministry is a duty of Divine obligation. This is taught throughout the Scriptures. He who ordained that the tribe of Levi should be consecrated to the service of the altar, ordained also that the other tribes should contribute a certain ratio of their substance for the maintenance of the sacerdotal family. So, He who said 'Feed my sheep, feed my lambs,' has said that

'the workman is worthy of his meat;' and that 'the laboure is worthy of his hire.' The word rendered 'meat' is τροφ and means not only necessary food, but sustenance, or suppor in general; and the word rendered 'hire' is μισθὸς, and mean *recompense*. The doctrine taught by the Saviour is plainly that those who are devoted to the ministry are justly entitle to a comfortable living.

In a multitude of passages this doctrine is maintained. S Paul, employing the very words of the Saviour in reference t the same subject, says, 'The labourer is worthy of his reward —1 Tim. v. 18. Such declarations imply, that to render sup port to the Christian ministry is a debt of justice, and not donation of charity; that the devoted minister, who is separate from a worldly calling, in order that he may efficiently discharg the duties of his office, is as much entitled to support as th labouring husbandman is entitled to the salary he has earne by the sweat of his brow. The same Apostle, writing to th Galatians, enjoins, 'Let him that is taught in the word com municate unto him that teacheth in all good things.'—Chap. v 6. *To communicate* is, in the Scriptural sense, to contribute our worldly substance. And this passage teaches, that wh ever enjoys the privilege of hearing the ministry, is under a obligation to contribute to the support of the ministry by whic he is instructed and edified. The privilege and the duty a inseparable. He treats upon this subject at considerab length, and his statements are so clear and expressive that the cannot be misunderstood. He says—'Mine answer to the that do examine me is this, Have we not power to eat and drink? Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, a Cephas? Or I only and Barnabas, have we not power to fo bear working? Who goeth a warfare at any time at his ow charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fru thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk the flock? Say I these things as a man? or saith not the la the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, Th shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out t corn. Doth God take care for oxen? or saith he it altogeth for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: th he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thres

eth in hope should be partaker of his hope. If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar. EVEN SO HATH THE LORD ORDAINED THAT THEY WHICH PREACH THE GOSPEL SHOULD LIVE OF THE GOSPEL.'—1 Cor. ix. 3—11, 13, 14. Nothing can more clearly assert the right of a Gospel minister to claim, and the duty of a church to afford, reasonable support. This duty is founded upon the common principles of justice which all men admit; it is acknowledged by the established usages of society, and is enjoined by the authority of God; and that authority is as expressly stated in reference to this duty, as it is in reference to any precept in the Decalogue.

While thus positive evidence shines with a clearness like that of the noonday sun, the objections urged against it are as unsubstantial as the vapours which are dispersed by his beams.

1. It is alleged that our Lord said to his ministers, 'Freely ye have received, freely give;' and therefore the ministry is not to be supported. We reply: It is not clear that this passage refers to the ministry at all, but to the gift of miracles with which the apostles were endowed. Christ had given them 'power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease' (Matt. x. 1); and it is in immediate connection with their commission to exercise this power that he enjoins the command, 'Freely give.' Observe carefully this connection. He says, 'Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give.'—ver. 8. The power of working miracles was not to be bartered for money or any earthly advantage. It was a pure gift of God, and was to be exercised solely for his glory, and employed solely as an evidence to authenticate their mission as the ambassadors of God to man. To attempt, therefore, to exercise this power for a fee or reward, would be a grievous insult to God, and lead men to put contempt upon the Gospel, and reject it as a cunningly devised fable. This was the sin which Simon Magus had conceived in his heart, when he offered the apostles money to confer upon him the power of working miracles, and which Peter resisted with stern displeasure and indignation. This, too, was the sin

of Gehazi, who took two talents of silver and two changes of raiment for the cure which Elisha had effected; but he was struck with an incurable leprosy for his base covetousness and deceit. The most solemn reasons forbid the reception of gifts and rewards for the performance of miraculous deeds, of which God alone can be the author, and man merely the instrument. The noble resistance of Elisha, Peter, and other holy men, is a practical comment upon the command of Christ: freely they had received, and freely they were to bestow.

But suppose we admit that the precept applies to the exercise of the ministry, still, when viewed in conjunction with the context, it has evidently a meaning which gives no countenance to the free-Gospel system. That the Saviour did not intend that the apostles should receive no remuneration for their ministry, is evident from the facts of the case recorded in the context. For he sent them forth without any provision for their journey, and assigned as his reason, that the people to whom they ministered should provide for their wants. Let us attend to our Lord's own words, and take in the whole passage — 'Freely ye have received, freely give.' What follows is 'Provide for yourselves neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats neither shoes, nor yet a staff: for the workman is worthy of his support'—vs. 9 and 10. Now, had our Lord intended the Gospel to be preached free, undoubtedly he would have given directions contrary to these. He would have commanded them to provide themselves abundantly with all the clothing, provisions, and money they might require. But as they were specially commanded to go to no expense themselves, but to rest assured that all their need should be supplied by others the Saviour intended thus to teach them, that as he had called them to be exclusively devoted to the ministry, so it was his own appointment that they should be entirely supported from their work. Hence he subsequently appealed to them, saying 'When I sent you without purse, and scrip, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing.'—Luke xxii. 35. It appears that they were not only supported, but *well supported*— 'they lacked nothing.' Thus the passage, viewed in its proper connection, completely overturns the free-Gospel theory, by establishing the converse proposition.

But if the words, as applied to the ministry, do not mean the exclusion of all remuneration to the minister for his labour, it will be asked, In what sense can they be understood? What can be intended by the command, 'Freely give?' We reply, if there be a reference to the ministry (which is not the obvious sense, as we have shown), the precept simply means, that the apostles were to diffuse the whole truth, as far as revealed to them, 'freely,' without any reserve, concealment, or restraint. The priests of heathenism wrapt their doctrines in mystery and dark enigmas, that they might be concealed from the people. Poets veiled their truths in allegory; pagan philosophers taught their dogmas to the learned few; and the Saviour charged the Jewish doctors with having taken from the people the key of knowledge, and substituted their own inventions for the commandments of God. But the apostles were to adopt an opposite course. They had freely received the truth from the Saviour's own lips, and they were to promulgate it without reserve among the people. Divine light had come, and its Author would have it to be diffused with the clearness and the brightness of the day-spring. A royal edict of mercy was committed to them, and it must not be hidden in the heart, or faintly and tremulously uttered, but be proclaimed as with the trumpet of a herald, and send its gladdening echoes through all the tribes of the promised seed. Thus, in either sense, the passage favours not the notion that an unpaid ministry is the doctrine of the Bible, but clearly and fully establishes the contrary principle. It shows that the first ambassadors of mercy sent forth by the Redeemer, though their embassy was confined within the narrow precincts of their own nation, were to be abundantly supplied with all things necessary to their welfare, so that they should 'lack nothing.'

2. It is further alleged, that he who receives his support as a minister is a hireling, and our Lord describes a hireling as one that careth not for the sheep. We reply, the Saviour could not design to impugn a remunerated ministry, for that, as we have already seen, is his own appointed institution. The word 'hireling' is used in Scripture both in a good and bad sense. In a good sense it signifies merely a labourer, who faithfully discharges his duty to his master, and receives a due remuneration for his toil. This is in every sense proper; the

principles of justice require it; and our Lord himself says, 'The labourer is worthy of his hire.' But the word hireling, when used in a *bad* sense, signifies a selfish, mercenary individual, who has no interest in his master's welfare. It is doubtless in this latter sense that the word is used by the Saviour in the passage before us; hence, he is speaking of one who flees from the post of duty, and cares not for the sheep. Thus, the censure lies not against the occupation of the man as a shepherd, nor against his receiving a remuneration, but against his conduct and character as a *mere hireling*. It is not, therefore, the faithful minister who is intended to be reproved, but the unfaithful; not the minister who receives a remuneration for his work, but the minister who receives a remuneration while he does not work; who has neither the holy dispositions, nor the faithful, laborious character of a true shepherd of Christ's flock. It is against such the prophet Ezekiel declaims: 'Woe to the shepherds of Israel! . . . Ye eat the fat, and clothe you with the wool, and ye kill them that are fed: *but ye feed not the flock*.' This reprehension was directed against the indolence and unfaithfulness of some priests; not against the remuneration they received, for this was ordained of God. Ezekiel himself was a priest, and, as such, his maintenance was derived from his office, but he was faithful in the discharge of his duty, and fed the flock of God with knowledge and understanding. All ministers of his character were blessed and approved of God.

Further: a hireling minister is one who, while he lives by the Gospel, perverts it by preaching false doctrine, and who for gain and popularity, prophesies smooth things to the people. Such are they who are denounced in Jeremiah: 'Behold, I am against the prophets that smooth their tongues. . . . Behold I am against them that prophesy false dreams, saith the Lord and do tell them, and cause my people to err by their lies.' Here the reprehension is directed against the soul-destroying deceit and treachery of false prophets and priests, but no accusation is either expressed or implied against the upright and faithful minister, who shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God. Jeremiah himself was a priest as well as a prophet and, as such, was maintained by the tithes and contributions of the people. It is remarkable that those prophets who bore the

severest testimony against false, indolent, and time-serving ministers, were themselves of the sacerdotal order. Ezekiel and Jeremiah were not hirelings in the mercenary sense of the term, though, like other priests, they lived by their office. They were men of God, commissioned by his Spirit; and so are all God's faithful ambassadors. The testimony of the apostles is equally strong against all false teachers. Peter says, 'But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways: by reason of which the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they, with feigned words, make merchandise of you; whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.' The Apostle Paul had to contend with such false teachers, who perverted the Gospel of Christ, and endeavoured to alter it to suit the opinions and passions of men; and respecting such deceivers he uttered the awful anathema—'If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be ACCURSED.' In striking contrast with such, the true minister is described as one who has renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but, by manifestation of the truth, commending himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God.. He may receive his support from the ministry, as a great part of God's ministers in all ages have done, but he is not as 'many which corrupt the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God, he speaks in Christ.'

Again, a hireling minister, using the word in a mercenary sense, is one who preaches merely for hire, and would not preach without a remuneration; but a faithful minister preaches from a sense of duty, whether he has a remuneration or not. To advert, for the sake of example, to the case of a faithful Methodist minister: he preached the Gospel before he lived by it, and would still preach it were his living to be withdrawn. Though in this case his opportunity to labour would be seriously abridged, yet he would feel constrained by the love of Christ to testify the Gospel of the grace of God to the full

extent of his ability. He feels that a dispensation of the Gospel is committed unto him, and that woe is unto him if he preach not the Gospel. When a Methodist minister becomes exclusively devoted to the work, and receives a maintenance for his labours, he is *not hired to preach*, he is merely remunerated for the time which the Church requires him to surrender for its welfare; and as that time is all he has, the Church is bound in justice to afford him support. This is in perfect accordance with the arrangement of Christ and of the primitive Church under his direction. Those ministers who were not separated to the work lived by their occupation. Those who were separated to it were supported by the Church. Christ, therefore, in denouncing hirelings, could not be condemning the practice of supporting the ministry, for this was his own institution; he denounces the hypocrisy and selfishness of those who cared not for the sheep.

3. Those who object to a remunerated ministry, adduce the words of St Peter: 'Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind.' But this passage, when candidly examined, will be found to present additional evidence in support of our own proposition. It proves that a remunerated ministry was the order of the Church he was addressing; for had there been no remuneration connected with the ministry, there would have been no temptation to filthy lucre, and consequently the caveat against the temptation would have been totally out of place. It is inquired then, What can the Apostle intend by this admonitory injunction? We reply, the designation '*filthy lucre*' is a key to his meaning. The original word is αἰσχροκερδῶς, and it literally signifies, seeking gain from a sordid, vile disposition, or a desire for indecent, dishonourable gain. But this does not impugn a just and an honourable remuneration. The toil of the husbandman secures his maintenance; but this is not dishonourable. The support which God ordained for the Jewish priesthood was their gain; but this was neither vile nor dishonourable. The support of the apostles—evangelists, such as Barnabas and Silas; of Christian pastors, such as Timothy and Titus—was not '*filthy lucre*,' but just and honourable remuneration. Gain itself is not 'filthy,' but it is made so by dishonourable

dispositions and practices; even as money, of itself, is not the root of evil, but 'the *love* of money.' So, when men preach doctrines they do not believe, their gain is filthy. When men receive support for labour, and live in indolence, their gain is dishonourable; when men deal in the wretched barter of a truth unfelt, their gain is vile and dishonourable. When men preach for the sake of a living, or grasp after large salaries, they are greedy of filthy lucre. Such are the evils against which the Apostle admonishes us, and his admonition proves that a remunerated ministry was the recognized order of the churches at that period, as it is in the present day.

4. Objectors refer us to the example of Paul, who, it is alleged, laboured with his hands for his own support, that he might preach the Gospel without charge. In reply to this, we observe: 1. The Apostle did not say that this was the ordinary practice of God's ambassadors; but, on the contrary, he speaks of the other apostles, and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas, as deriving their maintenance from the ministry. 2. Nor does he state that secular labour was the ordinary means which he himself pursued for his support, but an *exception* to his ordinary course, adopted for special reasons. 3. The statement, that he had laboured with his hands, is connected with the most direct and unequivocal assertions, that the ministry had a Divine right to support from the churches, and that in following a secular calling he had waived a right which God had given him the privilege to claim. 4. It is evident from his own words that his toils for the bread which perisheth had subjected him to unnatural and excessive hardship. 'For ye remember, brethren, our labour and travail: for labouring night and day, because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the Gospel of God.'—1 Thess. ii. 9. 5. It is clear that, after all the Apostle's exertions, he was at times subject to privation and want, on account of not receiving the remuneration which the church was bound to afford; hence, he says, 'And when I was present with you, and WANTED, I was chargeable to no man.' 6. Though the Apostle was not supported by the Corinthian church, he derived assistance from others; for he states, 'I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service . . For that which was lacking to me the brethren of Macedonia

supplied: and in all things I have kept myself from being burdensome unto you, and so will I keep myself.'—2 Cor. xi. 8, 9. All these facts argue the sacred duty of the Christian Church to support the ministry.

The reasons which influenced the Apostle in waiving his right to support were special and temporary, and applied to certain localities only. In reference to one scene of his ministry, he says, 'As the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop me of this boasting in Achaia.' In this region there were special reasons in operation. One was the influence of a false teacher, who had insinuated his pernicious doctrine, and whose selfish conduct, in preaching for gain, was likely to bring the ministry into disrespect; therefore, to confound and abase this libeller, the Apostle would make the Gospel without charge. 'But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we. For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.' Another reason was, that the population of Achaia was one where democratic principles had engendered suspicion and jealousy, and led them sometimes to undervalue their best benefactors, and banish, by ostracism, the noblest patriots from their country.

In two other places the Apostle declined to claim his right to support. In Ephesus—but this city was inhabited by a Grecian colony; and besides, St Paul foresaw that men would arise within the bosom of that church to draw away disciples after them, and pervert the ministry to secular and sinister purposes. In Thessalonica, also, Paul, during part of his time at least, laboured with his hands; but here another reason operated—namely, the indolent habits of the people. He says, 'Neither did we eat any man's bread for nought; but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you: not because we had not power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us. For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies.' When such reasons obtain, a minister may safely follow the example of the Apostle.

If a people have such morbid jealousies as can be subdued by no other means, a minister may refuse to receive their support; or, if they have such inveterate habits of indolence as can be shamed by no other procedure, a minister may decline to accept a maintenance from their reluctant hands. In such a case the disgrace falls not upon the minister, but upon the people who subject him to such an extremity.

5. It has often been alleged that, admitting the maintenance of the ministry to be Scriptural, yet there is no inspired authority for a minister's receiving a stated and specified salary. We reply: this statement is not correct, as, in the Old Testament, the tenth of the nation's produce was specified as the portion to be appropriated to the support of the ministers of religion, in addition to a participation in the free-will offerings presented by the people. And although in the New Testament there is no such definite prescription as to the extent of support to be rendered to a minister, yet the principle laid down is, that his necessities should be supplied—that he should be provided with a comfortable maintenance.

6. It is further objected that a supported ministry is promotive of covetousness, spiritual despotism, profligacy, and indolence. We reply: it has already been proved that a remunerated ministry is an institution of God himself, who knows best what is adapted to the interests of religion; and therefore the objection is a direct reflection against the wisdom of God. Besides, it is not only bad in principle, but false in point of fact, and this we shall show in reference to each item in the allegation. We affirm that—

The ministry is not promotive of a covetous and selfish disposition. It is true that where there is a prospect of large income, cupidity may be excited in a minister; but this evil arises not from the nature of his office, but from a defective or corrupt system, which presents the temptation. The dedication of a man to the ministry of the word of God and prayer is surely not a means calculated to excite the covetous or selfish principle, but the reverse; and the ordinary prospects of men in the ministry are not of that character to attract a mind eager for riches. If the ministry engendered covetousness, its effect would be to lead men from the ministry into worldly business, for *there* the temptation lies. Demas forsook the ministry for

the world, and immense numbers would follow his example, were they not held to their office by the high principles of duty.

The assertion that a remunerated ministry is unfavourable to the active and general diffusion of Christianity, is false, and volumes of evidence prove its falsehood. The history of the Church establishes the following conclusions:—*First*, that where there is no remunerated ministry, Christianity ceases to be aggressive, and obtains no propagation, or is diffused in so small a measure as to be scarcely taken into the account; *secondly*, where no *lay* agency is employed in connection with the regular ministry, evangelical truth makes but small progress; and *thirdly*, where both a remunerated ministry and a lay agency are recognized, encouraged, and vigorously employed, there Divine truth spreads, prospers, and triumphs. Now let us look at facts. One section of Independent Methodists reject a remunerated ministry; but they have never prospered; several of their societies have become extinct, and others seem ready to expire. The Society of Friends reject the institution of a paid ministry, but they make no progress, except by natural issue—their children being constituted members by the laws of their community. The Established Church acknowledges no lay ministers, and makes but a feeble aggression upon the world, and slow advancement in the number of pious members. The Independents and the Baptists employ lay agency to a limited extent, and they exhibit much more energy, and enjoy much more prosperity, than the Established Church. With Methodist communities it is a principle to employ a remunerated ministry to the full extent of their pecuniary means, and a lay ministry to the full extent of their ability; and what is the result? One hundred and thirty-two years ago Methodism had no existence; but now it may be asked, Where does it not exist? Where is its blessed influence not felt? Besides reviving religion in other churches, it has filled our own land with religious light, with a living and efficient ministry, and thousands of Sabbath schools. It has extended to the regions beyond, and, despite all opposition, has fixed itself in every quarter of the world. It has hastily followed the track of the navigator, and tamed and blessed the most savage islanders with the enlightening and soul-transforming influence

of Gospel principles. It has anticipated the researches of the traveller and the enterprise of the colonist, in exploring the dark regions of the earth, as the scenes where its benign labours might illuminate, bless, and save degraded man. And now this system of yesterday has under its instruction more than ten millions of souls.

The advantages of the system combining both a regular and a lay ministry are innumerable, and volumes might be written to show its adaptation to the wants of society, to give impulse to intellect, to rouse and excite that mass of latent talent which God has diffused through the lowest as well as the highest conditions of life, to open spheres of honourable usefulness to men of every grade, and give scope and efficiency to human effort, to resuscitate and extend religion, to make the Church alive, to make her *instinct* with life, to cause her wakeful eye to beam with intelligence, her healthful heart to burn with charity, and her hands, ever open and ever employed, to diffuse throughout the world the blessings of redeeming love, until the brightness of millennial glory shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. Our heart's desire and prayer is, that the Lord of the harvest may send forth more labourers; may increase tenfold the number of ministers of both orders. Brethren, look at this subject in the light of Scripture. Let your ministers, who have left their all for your sake, and the sake of Christ, have your generous confidence and willing support; let your lay ministers share in your esteem and love as the ambassadors of Christ; and let all have an interest in your warm affections and earnest prayers. In urging this duty we are inviting you to inherit an inestimable privilege; for, while jealousy and grudging are the parents of spiritual barrenness and strife, grievous to the Holy Spirit, and deeply injurious to the cause of God, the opposite dispositions foster the graces of the Spirit, secure the Divine approval, and promote the prosperity and enlargement of the Church of God. A generous confidence in the ministry is well pleasing to God, for it honours his own institution; and liberality in its support is a sacrifice acceptable, for it furnishes the Church with means to increase the number of holy and laborious men, to devote their whole life in extending religion both at home and abroad. The true spirit of the Church is that which exclaims, 'How

beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!'

CHAPTER XX.

THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM.

'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'—MATT. xxviii. 19.

'And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway.'—ACTS xvi. 33.

IN Christian baptism there are four things to be considered—the authority, the import, the subjects, and the mode of the ordinance.

I. THIS ORDINANCE IS OF GOD.—It is expressly commanded by Christ himself, and can neither have nor need any higher authority than his word. The command to baptize stands connected with the great commission to preach the Gospel to every creature. This marks at once its importance, its universality, and its perpetual obligation; for it is co-existent, co-extensive, and co-enduring with the great commission itself. He who commanded to teach and to preach the Gospel, commanded also to baptize; and he who prescribes the Gospel as a universal remedy for mankind, enjoins, in the same breath, baptism as a universal duty. The Society of Friends, and all others who deny the obligation of baptism, come into direct collision with the solemn injunction of our Lord.

This collision, however, they seek to evade, by alleging that the baptism enjoined is that of the Holy Ghost. We reply: Our Lord enjoined an external ordinance; and an external ordinance cannot be resolved into an internal or spiritual gift. Admitting that the ordinance is significant of the bestowment of the Holy Spirit, still the ordinance itself must be administered in order to have that signification. Assuredly, the apostles of our Lord, to whom the command was originally given, must have understood the nature of the duty enjoined; and their practice shows that they regarded it as the performance of an

external rite. On the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost was given in its fulness, and the apostles spoke and acted under his immediate inspiration, they both commanded men to be baptized with water, and administered the ordinance themselves to three thousand persons.—Acts ii. 38—41.

Moreover, the rite of baptism was administered under circumstances which showed that the ordinance itself was neither a substitute for the gift of the Spirit, nor the gift of the Spirit a substitute for the ordinance, but that both were imperatively required. Usually, the Holy Spirit was given *after* baptism, showing that the external rite was not sufficient of itself, but was to be regarded as the emblem and the precursor of spiritual blessings. Yet sometimes the Spirit fell on believers *before* they were baptized, as when Peter was preaching in the house of Cornelius; nevertheless, though the Spirit was given, the ordinance of baptism was both commanded and administered *afterwards* by Peter himself (Acts x. 44—48); a fact which shows that the gift of the Spirit, when bestowed, did not supersede the ordinance commanded by Christ. Sometimes, however, baptism was administered, though no spiritual gift either preceded or followed, as in the case of Simon Magus (Acts viii. 9—24); thus showing that baptism, though imperative as a duty, was not necessarily efficacious to salvation. From these examples it is evident that baptism, as a ceremony, was as distinct from baptism by the Holy Ghost as any two things can be; and that the apostles understood the command of our Lord as enjoining a duty at once imperative and indispensable. If, therefore, it was imperative on the apostles to administer, and the early Christians to receive the ordinance, it must be equally imperative on us at the present day; and what God has ordained let no man dare to disannul.

II. The Import of this Ordinance.—Baptism, under the New Testament, stands in the place of circumcision under the old dispensation, as will appear from the following considerations:—

1. *Baptism, like circumcision, was appointed at the inauguration of a new dispensation;* not new in it essence, for in its essence it is identical with the Abrahamic, as that, in its essence and spiritual character, was identical with the first promise of a Saviour. Christ, indeed, was the great theme and centre of

each; the salvation of mankind was the object of each; and to each is the term 'Gospel,' or the good tidings of mercy, equally applicable, as being but varied stages of the development of Jehovah's great plan of redemption. In the revelations of the Abrahamic dispensation we see the first great principles of evangelic truth repeated, accompanied with additional promises and prophecies, which gave a more definite form and comprehensive outline to the purposes of mercy. The ancient promise of a Saviour stands there conspicuous, under the designation of 'The Seed,' but coupled with a further promise assuring the patriarch that 'The Seed' should spring from himself according to the flesh, and that 'all nations should be blessed in him.' Here are the germs of universal redemption, of which the patriarch himself is made a personal partaker by a 'faith that is imputed to him for righteousness.' Connected with this gracious revelation, the rite of circumcision was instituted, both as a ratification of God's covenant of redemption, and as a significant and ineffaceable symbol, reminding Abraham of 'The promised Seed' that should, in the fulness of time, proceed from his loins. So baptism was ordained at the inauguration of the Christian dispensation, when the promised Saviour had come and completed his atoning work, and when a commission was given to proclaim the blessings of salvation to 'all nations,' as God had promised to Abraham. Thus, the anticipations of the Abrahamic faith being realized, circumcision, as its sign, and as the reminding symbol of 'The Seed' that was to come, was no longer appropriate. It was therefore abolished, and baptism, as a more simple and expressive rite, was ordained in its stead—significantly indicating, by the use of water, the cleansing power of that Spirit whose fulness is the glory of the new dispensation. So evident is this substitution of baptism for circumcision, that it is expressly called 'the circumcision of Christ' (Col. ii. 10—12); and baptized believers are said to be of the true 'circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.'—Phil. iii. 3. It should here be observed, that as the rite of circumcision was commanded to be performed on both infants and adults in the patriarch's household, as well as on himself, so the administration of baptism, as the substitute of circumcision, is to be performed on both

adults and infants, as we shall hereafter prove. Hence, in preaching the Gospel to the Jew, the Pagan, or the Mahometan, or to any who have not received this ordinance, we require their baptism as a condition of membership; and subsequently we administer the ordinance to their offspring, agreeably with the command given to the patriarch, and the great commission to 'baptize all nations.'

2. *Baptism, like the rite of circumcision, is a profession of faith in Jehovah as the true and only God.*—Hence, when Jehovah enjoined this ordinance on Abraham, he proclaimed himself as the true God, saying, 'I am the Almighty God.' And Abraham, by performing the rite on himself at God's command, formally avowed Jehovah to be his God; and, in circumcising his offspring, he openly declared his intention that his children should be trained up in the knowledge and service of the same glorious Being. So of the other patriarchs; so of the Jews in general; and so of the other branches of the Abrahamic family. So long as they continued to observe the ordinance of circumcision, it was to them and their children a profession of faith in the only true God, and a badge of their distinction from surrounding idolaters. It is so in baptism. In receiving or administering this rite, we openly disown all other gods but Jehovah; and in bringing our children to the sacred font, we declare both our own faith in him as the only true God, and our purpose to train up our children in the knowledge of his name. Hence, we find baptism, like circumcision, is associated by our Lord with a formal declaration of God's great Name, and conjoined with an express command that the ordinance shall be performed in that Name—'Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;' from which it is evident that we cannot perform this ordinance aright unless we conjoin with it a proclamation of God's Name. That Name is expressive of his nature; and that nature is here indicated to be not an absolute unity, but a trinity; the threefold Name expressing a threefold personality—'the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.' Each Divine person stands in the same relation to us as our God; and therefore each distinctly, and all conjointly, are related to us as the one Jehovah whom we profess to worship and adore. Thus, baptism is a perpetual monument of a great

and fundamental truth—the Trinity; and one design of the ordinance is to be a means of proclaiming and perpetuating this truth, of preserving it from oblivion or corruption, and of publishing it before the Church and the world through all the ages of time.

3. *Baptism, like circumcision, is a solemn dedication to God's service.*—When Jehovah proclaimed himself as 'The Almighty God' to Abraham, and enjoined upon him the rite of circumcision, it is twice asserted that the patriarch reverently bowed himself to the earth: 'he fell on his face before God'—the most devout acknowledgment of submission to God's authority and the consecration of himself to God's service. The rite of circumcision was itself an act of submission and consecration to God, and it remained as an ineffaceable sign in his flesh that he had given himself to God. So, when he performed the same rite on his children, it was the act of a pious father putting God's sign and seal on his offspring, as a visible expression of that domestic piety and paternal influence of which God himself bore testimony when he said, 'I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord.' Christian baptism implies the same devout purpose and solemn obligation. The adult, in this ordinance, gives himself to God. He 'puts off the body of the sins of the flesh' by this 'circumcision of Christ,' and puts on the Lord Jesus; and being 'buried with him in baptism,' and rising with him into new life, he receives the sign of full consecration to God. So the Christian parent, in presenting his child for baptism, solemnly devotes it to God as a living and reasonable sacrifice to his service and glory.

4. *Baptism, like circumcision, is a sign and seal of God's covenant.*—When Jehovah commanded circumcision, as an ordinance, to be performed by Abraham on himself and on his children, he made it both a sign and a seal of his covenant saying, 'I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised.'—Gen. xvii. 7, 10. The covenant which God thus made with Abraham comprised the original promise of the Sa

viour, combined with other important promises, partly temporal, but chiefly spiritual. Indeed, the main temporal blessings were themselves types of the spiritual and eternal; for, personally, Abraham received not the fulfilment of the temporal: the fulfilment of these was reserved for his distant posterity; but the spiritual he did receive and enjoy to his personal salvation and everlasting life (compare Gen. xvii. with Rom. iv., Gal. iii., and Heb. xi. 8—19). Now, circumcision was the sign performed on himself and on his offspring in token of his belief in, and acceptance of, God's covenant, with all its promises and all its conditions; and it was, at the same time, God's own seal put on them, as a visible ratification of his truth, and as a pledge of his fidelity. So baptism takes the place of circumcision, as the sign and seal of our covenant with God; for the Abrahamic covenant and the Christian covenant are spiritually one and the same. The only difference is, that the Saviour anticipated by Abraham is accepted by us as having come; the temporal promises are dropped, having been fulfilled in the history of the Jewish nation, and the spiritual are more fully developed and enlarged. So identical, indeed, are the two covenants in their spiritual nature, that they are both designated by the same name—'the Gospel;' for it is said that 'the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.'—Gal. iii. 8. So identical are Christian believers with Abraham in their spiritual nature, position, and relations, that they are expressly called his 'children;' for 'they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.'—Gal. iii. 7. And so identical are they in privileges, that they are said to inherit the same blessings; for 'they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.'—Gal. iii. 9. Abraham was saved by faith; so are we. He believed in the Saviour who was to come; we believe in the Saviour who has come. Abraham, being justified by faith, was called the friend of God; so are we, for, being justified by faith, we have peace with God. Abraham had communion with God; so have we, for 'truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ;' and 'we both (Jews and Gentiles) have access by one Spirit unto the Father.' Abraham was an heir of the heavenly Canaan, and 'he looked for a city

which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God ;' so do we, for we are heirs of God, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. Abraham's covenant implied unreserved obedience to God, even to the sacrificing of his own son, had God required it; so does the Gospel covenant require from us unreserved obedience, to love God with all our hearts, and to glorify him in our body and in our spirit, which are his. Abraham received, as the sign and seal of this covenant, the rite of circumcision ; and we receive, as the sign and seal of our covenant with God, the rite of baptism. Performed on the adult believer, it is the sign of his personal acceptance of God's covenant, and the seal or public ratification of God's covenant with him. Performed on the infant, it is a public recognition of the great doctrine of universal redemption and of infant salvation ; it is thus the sign and the seal of that covenant through which they are saved from the curse of original sin, and made the children of God.

5. *Baptism, like circumcision, is an initiatory rite of admission into the visible Church.*—In every age of the world it has been God's design to have a people who should openly acknowledge and worship him as their God, and whom he himself should acknowledge as his people ; who should be, collectively, the depository of his revelations, the conservators and partakers of his covenanted promises ; and these constitute his visible Church. It was so even in the antediluvian age. When Cain had severed himself from God's covenant and departed from the Divine presence, the family of Seth was chosen as God's people and henceforth we see a broad line of demarcation between the godly descendants of Seth and the evil progeny of Cain. The former were designated 'the sons of God,' but the latter 'the children of men.' The former 'called upon the name of God ;' the latter were given up to secular and sinful pursuits. The former were the Church ; the latter were the world. We trace this line of distinction clear and definite from Seth to the birth of Noah ; and it was only when the boundary line was broken down, by mixed marriages and worldly conformity, that general wickedness and corruption ensued. When God called Abraham out from his idolatrous kinsmen to go into the land of Canaan, it was that he and his posterity should be separated from the heathen world and become his peculiar people, the re

cipients of his revelations and promises, and the ostensible representatives of his truth, his worship, and his covenants; and that, not for themselves alone, but for the benefit of the world. These, in the line of Isaac, constituted the Jewish Church, and admission thereto was by circumcision. This was the gate of entrance for the Jew and for the Gentile proselyte. The uncircumcised had no place in the congregation of the Lord—no claim to their privileges; but all who were admitted to this rite, whether Gentile or Jew, and their children, were numbered among God's heritage. They were not, indeed, all partakers of personal salvation, for personal salvation depended on their personal faith; but they stood in a peculiar relation to God, distinct from the outside heathen world, and they enjoyed privileges which, if improved, would conduce to their personal salvation; and for this gracious result the privileges were always intended, though often abused or neglected. To them pertained the 'adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.' —Rom. ix. 4. The same purpose of God runs forward into the Christian dispensation, and hence a visible church organization, with its members, pastors, teachers, deacons, and elders, and the various privileges of united worship and Christian fellowship, appear in the very earliest records of apostolic labours. On the day of Pentecost, when three thousand were added to the Church, they were all admitted thereto by baptism; and this was the constant process in apostolic times. The command of Christ required, and the labours of the apostles exhibited, the uniform practice of baptism as the badge of the Christian profession, and the formal recognition of all who received the Gospel, and passed from Judaism and heathenism into the Christian Church. Even the miraculous call of the Apostle Paul, and the previous bestowment of the Holy Ghost on the congregation in the house of Cornelius, formed no exceptions to the requirement of God. Wherever God had a people, his own sign and seal of baptism was to be upon them.

6. *Neither circumcision nor baptism constitutes regeneration.* —This truth is implied in what we have already stated, and is sustained by the clearest and most ample evidence. In reference to the ancient ordinance, it is asserted that 'he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision,

which is outward in the flesh : but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly ; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter' (Rom. ii. 28, 29) ; and further it is declared that 'neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision ; but faith which worketh by love.'—Gal. v. 6. Baptism, which takes the place of circumcision, has, in itself, no more saving or renewing efficacy ; for though it is said that baptism doth save us, it is affirmed, in the same breath, that it is not the baptism of water which is a *type*, but that baptism which is '*the antitype*' (*ἀντίτυπον*)—that is, the *spiritual* baptism ; 'not the putting away of the filth of the flesh (as by washing with water), but the answer of a good conscience toward God.' This is the 'washing of regeneration, *even* (*καὶ*) the renewing of the Holy Ghost.'—1 Peter iii. 21 ; Titus iii. 5. The truth thus so clearly taught in didactic statement is confirmed and illustrated by thousands of examples. Ananias and Sapphira were both baptized ; but in seeking a false reputation, by lying unto the Holy Ghost, they proved that their hearts were unchanged. Simon Magus was baptized, but baptism did not regenerate him ; for inspired authority declares that he still remained 'in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity.' See baptismal regeneration fully disproved, in pages 386—392.

But if baptism does not regenerate, it may be inquired by some, What does it avail ? We reply, The ordinance is commanded by God, and it always avails to obey God's commands, even though we could assign no reason for them. Though baptism itself does not regenerate or save us, it answers other important purposes, some of which have already been stated. It is a monument or sign of great and fundamental truths—the Trinity, the apostasy and depravity of man, our redemption by Christ, the promise of the Holy Spirit and his sanctifying power. In every instance when the ordinance is administered, it is God's own seal or pledge of his fidelity ; and, at the same time, it is our seal solemnly affixed to God's truth—our public declaration of belief in God's veracity in maintaining his holy covenant. Nor are the benefits few or small. Our faith is thereby established, the Church guarded against fatal errors, our prayers and the prayers of God's congregation are heard, spiritual influences are secured for ourselves and our offspring,

and the Divine complacency rests on the obedience and the spiritual sacrifice involved in this holy ordinance.

III. The Subjects of Baptism.—This is comparatively a modern question; ancient opinion being so unanimous on this subject as hardly to cause a ripple of controversy. In modern times, however, the question has been discussed with a degree of heat and acrimony which we shall carefully avoid. We maintain, with the Church of God in general, that both adults and infants are proper subjects of Christian baptism; adult converts not previously baptized, and their offspring. Our Baptist friends totally exclude infants from this ordinance. If, then, the term Baptist be a proper designation for a Christian Church, without giving offence, we may affirm that the term would be more appropriate to ourselves than to those who have assumed it; for with us the ordinance is applicable to persons of all ages, whereas they limit and restrict its application. It is, therefore, a misnomer to designate us by the term *Pædo-baptists;* for, as is evident in this treatise, we contend as earnestly for adult baptism as we do for infant baptism, believing that both are comprised in the great commission of our Lord. We shall, therefore, briefly state the Scriptural grounds of infant baptism.

Seeing that all infants are involved in the consequences of Adam's fall—a truth evident from their evil nature and their mortality—and seeing, too, that about one-third of all that are born die while in infancy, it would be a matter of sombre and gloomy reflection if the volume of revelation had said nothing hopeful about the condition and destiny of so vast a portion of the human family, and of their relation to God's covenant and Church. The thought of one-third of the world's population passing away, generation after generation, into a dark and unknown eternity, would have cast a deep and awful shadow on the great question of our being, and quenched half the joy that rings in the tidings of our salvation. But, thanks to God, revelation is not silent, but jubilant on this subject. There is no brighter page in the Gospel than that which speaks of the condition and destiny of infant children and their relation to God's Church. It tells us that all infant children are in a state of salvation, that all dying in infancy enter into the kingdom of heaven, and that all have a right to the sign and seal of

God's covenant ordinance, as a public recognition of their being members of Christ's mystical body. Further, it shows us that this recognition is an element in God's gracious dispensations, whether Jewish or Christian. The establishment of these great truths will show our Divine warrant for infant baptism.

1. *All infant children are in a state of actual salvation.*—This is manifest from the completeness and universal fulness of our redemption by Christ Jesus—a doctrine which pervades the Gospel, which is everywhere implied, and often asserted in the plainest terms. Take, for example, the positive affirmations of Paul and of John: 'Christ died for all.'—2 Cor. v. 15. 'He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but for the whole world.'—1 John ii. 2. 'Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ.'—Rom. v. 20, 21. Here it is plainly asserted that the provisions of grace are co-extensive with the curse of sin; the economy that secures life is fully commensurate with the sentence that bringeth death. As the latter is universal, so is the former. As infants, therefore, are subject to death through the apostasy of the first Adam, they are redeemed and saved, even unto eternal life, by the interposition of the second Adam. No adverse criticism can shake this truth. It is here written by the finger of God, and no ingenuity can blot it out. If confirmation of a truth so plain were needed, we have it in the benign declaration of the Saviour himself, when he took the little ones in his arms and blessed them, saying, 'Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.'—Mark x. 14. Whether the word τοιούτων be understood to mean 'of such individuals' or 'of such characters,' the application is the same; it expresses, at least, a state which fits for God's kingdom, and that is a state of salvation. And whether the term 'the kingdom of God,' be understood to mean the kingdom of grace on earth or the kingdom of glory in heaven, it matters not, for either meaning is equally available for our argument. For to be in such a state, or to be such a person, as to belong to the kingdom of grace, implies to be fit also for the kingdom of glory; and to be fit for the kingdom of glory, implies to be

in a state of grace and salvation. Such, then, is the state of little children, as declared by Him who died for them; whose omniscience penetrates into the condition of all human beings, whether infants or adults, and whose infallible teaching is the test and the standard of truth. Little children, then, are declared by Christ to be in a state of salvation, and, as such, to belong to the kingdom of God; so that, dying in infancy, they inherit that gift of God which is eternal life, which comes to them in an absolute mode through the expiatory death of the Son of God.

2. *Such being the state of infant children, they are, and are declared to be, actual members of the true spiritual Church of Christ; and if thus members of his true spiritual Church, they are fit to be recognized, and are recognized by God, as members of the visible Church.*—Whatever doubt there may be of the fitness of some adults for this position, there can be none respecting the fitness of infants; for their claim rests on a fitness that is actual, and declared to be such by God himself. This being the case, it is not unreasonable to suppose that, in framing the economy of his visible Church, God would ordain some method by which the state of infants and their relation to himself should be openly indicated and recognized, and that this recognition should stand out as a legible fact, patent to the observation of all men. He has done this by fixing upon them the sign and seal of his gracious covenant of salvation; under the Jewish economy, by circumcision; and under the Christian, by baptism.

Under the Jewish economy, by circumcision.—Whether any ritual sign was ordained under the antediluvian dispensation, the brevity of the Divine record respecting that age does not enable us to determine; but most evidently the children of pious parents, even then, were both associated with them in God's covenant of grace, and were recognized in that relation. Hence the distinction, already noticed, between the family of Seth and the family of Cain, in their genealogies, their associations, and the peculiar title of the former as 'the sons of God.' When Jehovah separated Abraham from his idolatrous kinsmen, and ordained a dispensation in which his Church should stand out in visible distinction from the Pagan world, he appointed, as we have already seen, circumcision as the sign and

seal of his covenant; and the same command which enjoined the rite on himself, required it to be performed on his offspring, and onward from one generation to another. Let us hear the Word of God—'And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy generations after thee. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every male child that is among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male child in your generations.' The same command was extended to all the male members of his household and their children; and it is further added—'And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.'—Gen. xvii. 9—14. Such was God's command; and, to mark the promptitude of Abraham's obedience, as well as the vigour and activity of his faith, it is added that on the self-same day did Abraham circumcise himself, his son Ishmael, and all the males of his own household. Respecting the ordinance of circumcision as here enjoined, six things are to be observed:—1. It began with adult believers—Abraham and the male servants of his household. 2. It descended to their children, and was to be performed upon them when they were only eight days old. 3. It was a perpetual ordinance, being obligatory upon each generation to the end of the dispensation. 4. It is declared to be a sign and a seal of God's covenant. 5. That covenant was especially the covenant of redemption through the promised Saviour; and that redemption comprised, as we have already seen, the actual salvation of all infant children. 6. From these premises, it follows, that circumcision on infant children was God's own public recognition of children as members of his Church, because they were in a state of actual salvation. If the sign of circumcision recognizes the adults members of God's Church, with still more certainty did it recognize the infants, because their salvation was absolute.

We are fully aware of the objection usually alleged against this view by our Anti-pædobaptist brethren, namely—that the covenant with Abraham included temporal blessings, such as

the possession of the land of Canaan for an inheritance; and, therefore, circumcision on his children was the sign and seal of the covenant merely in reference to the promise of temporal and national blessings. But this objection is overthrown by the fact, that this right was enjoined and performed on those who had no share whatever in the temporal part of the Abrahamic covenant. Thus, it was performed by Divine command on all the male servants of Abraham's household, and their children; also on Ishmael and on Esau, and their children, who diverged into distinct nations, and had, therefore, no share in the *temporal* promises of the covenant. Yet it was said to be the sign of God's covenant to them even as it was to Isaac and Jacob. But if a sign of God's covenant to those who had thus no share in the *temporal* promises, of what part of the covenant was it a sign to them? Plainly of the *spiritual* part —the promises of redemption, which had no restriction or limitation to race or nation, but included Ishmael and Esau, as well as Isaac and Jacob, Gentile as well as Jew, bond as well as free; and the sign and seal of God's covenant on the children of such, was God's open and public attestation of their salvation and their title to eternal life, and by consequence, of their real membership in his true spiritual Church.

The same recognition of infant children was continued under the Christian dispensation.—We have already seen that the Abrahamic and the Christian covenant are one in their spiritual import, and we have shown that baptism took the place of circumcision, as an initiatory ordinance. There was no change in the covenant, except that of advanced light and extended privilege. The temporal elements of the old were, indeed, done away, because fulfilled; but the spiritual were enlarged— by the completion of human redemption, by the appointment of a special agency to go forth and invite all nations to participate in Gospel blessings, and by the promised fulness of the Holy Spirit's ministration. There was no change whatever in the relation of children, for that relation was based upon the universality of redemption itself, and that relation was rendered evident by the oft-repeated declarations of inspired apostles, and the express words of the Redeemer himself. Their relationship to Christ being the same, it might be expected there would still be a visible recognition of that relation by some appointed

sign and seal of his covenant being affixed upon them. Accordingly, we find that, in the inauguration of the Gospel economy, the command to baptize 'all nations' is incorporated with the commission to preach the Gospel to 'all nations;' both are universal in their terms, having no limits but the bounds of human population. Had there been a design to limit the ordinance by the exclusion of children, whose relation to Christ had hitherto been always recognized, this would have been the place to denote it; and to indicate a change so great, the notice must have been emphatic and unmistakable. Yet no change or limitation is intimated, either by special instruction or implication; but, on the contrary, the commission to baptize is co-extensive with the commission to make disciples and to teach. Therefore, as the covenant itself was the same in all its spiritual provisions, and the relation of infants to Christ was the same, and the sign and seal of the covenant is authorized to be imparted with a universality commensurate with the Gospel commission, it is a strange and unwarrantable interference to alter and abolish that which God has ordained, and grounded upon the first and fundamental principles of the Gospel economy.

Nor is the evidence for infant baptism weakened by repentance and faith being required as antecedent qualifications for baptism, in such passages as these:—'Repent ye, therefore, and be baptized;' 'He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved,' &c.; for all such passages were addressed to *adults*, from whom repentance and faith were required as conditions of salvation. A like profession of faith was required from Jewish proselytes prior to their circumcision. And not only a profession of faith, but actual faith was required from the patriarch Abraham before he was circumcised; for before he was circumcised he believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness; and thus 'he received the sign of circumcision, as a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised.' Yet, notwithstanding this requirement of faith from him as an adult before he was circumcised, his progeny were required to be circumcised when only eight days old, before they could either repent or believe. The truth is, that both baptism and circumcision presuppose a state of grace, which adults, being sinners, cannot have without repentance

and faith. But infant children require no repentance, having committed no actual sin; and they require no faith, because, as their fallen state is involuntary, and brought upon them by another, so is their salvation involuntary and absolute, through the undertaking of Christ; and being already in a state of grace, and in God's covenant, baptism does but recognize in infants already the same state of grace as that into which adult believers are brought by repentance and faith. For these reasons we would not decline the baptism of the children even of those parents who, according to modern usage, are not recognized as members of the Church. If such parents bring them to the sanctuary for baptism, it is, at least, a profession of their faith in the Gospel; and though they should not be personally in a state of salvation, their children unquestionably are, and as such are entitled to Christian baptism,

This position of children seems to be emphatically recognized by the Apostle on the day of Pentecost. As this was the jubilant day when the Christian dispensation was fully opened, and the blessings of a full and free salvation were offered to Jew and Gentile, it is reasonable to expect some allusion to be made to the relation in which children stood to the covenant; and we find it announced in the sermon of Peter, its language so nearly allied to the memorable promise made to Abraham, as to render it morally certain he made a direct allusion to that promise. 'For,' he declares, 'the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.' Fully to appreciate the force of this declaration respecting children, we must put ourselves in the place of him who uttered it, and of those who heard it. Peter was a Jew, who knew well the relationship in which children had always stood in the ancient covenant; and those who heard the promise were also Jews, deeply sensible of the Divinely sanctioned privileges of their offspring by circumcision. Indeed, the severance of their offspring from the visible Church would at once have shocked their religious convictions, and been lamented as a grievous calamity. But the declaration of the Apostle reassured them that the Abrahamic covenant, in all its fulness of spiritual blessings, was reiterated and ratified under the Christian dispensation. 'The promise is unto you and your children,' just as the promises of old.

3. *In conformity with this view, we find that the apostles baptized, not only believing parents, but their households.*—The term 'household,' in the ordinary sense, includes all the children in a family. Thus, when it is said, 'Joseph nourished his father and his brethren, and all his father's household with bread, according to their families,' little children are included. When the industrious mother is described as 'looking well to the ways of her household,' the term includes her children; for it is added, 'her children rise up, and call her blessed.' When circumcision was administered by Abraham on himself, it was extended to all his house, which included the children of himself and of his male servants. When the jailer's baptism is narrated, it is said that 'he was baptized, he and all his straightway.' Whatever family he had they were all baptized at the same time with himself; and though it is said that the word of the Lord was spoken to all that were in his house, and that he rejoiced, believing in God with all his house, it does not follow that no infants were in the family; for, in similar phrase, it is also said of the nobleman at Capernaum, that he believed and all his house, though his sick son is called by him a 'child,' the diminutive term παιδίον being used, which commonly means an infant—an infant not yet circumcised—or a very young child.—John iv. 53. When Lydia was baptized, her household were also baptized with her.—Acts xvi. 15. Paul baptized 'the household of Stephanas;' and it seems probable that when he baptized Crispus, he baptized his household also at the same time.—1 Cor. i. 16. Many attempts have been made by our Anti-pædobaptist friends to prove that in these and other families no infants existed, but all such attempts are in vain. The probabilities are against all such reasoning. The baptizing of parents and their households is just the phraseology which accords with the usage, in reference to the administration of circumcision, in the families of the Jews in general; and it is just the language we should expect to find in reference to Christian baptism, when administered to parents and their offspring. It harmonizes perfectly with God's plan, with the recognized condition of infants, with the responsibilities of parents, and the words of the great commission which make the duty of baptizing co-ordinate and co-extensive with discipling and teaching, both being imperative and universal.

4. *In conformity with this view, we find the children of Christian parents are spoken of as being 'holy,' in a ceremonial or relative sense.*—'Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.'—1 Cor. vii. 14. The case referred to is, indeed, one in which only one of the parents was a baptized believer; yet the children of such being, by their relation to a Christian parent, saved from the pollution of heathenism, and dedicated to God by baptism, are accounted 'holy,' their spiritual relationship to Christ being thus recognized. Accordingly, we find children addressed by St Paul as members of the Church of God, and as inheritors of God's covenant promises. 'Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise.'—Eph. vi. 1, 2. In the same manner are children addressed in Col. iii. 20. Now here children are recognized along with their parents as 'in the Lord,' and as eligible, like them, to the promises of the covenant; in all respects they are treated as members of the Christian Church, under its discipline, bound by its obligations, entitled to its blessings, and, like their parents, subject to pastoral authority; but no persons, young or old, were in this position, except the baptized; and the only legitimate inference is, that these children had been already subject to this ordinance. This conclusion is the more evident from the fact, that though the Apostle exhorts them to other religious duties, he does not exhort them to be baptized. And why not? If exhorted to other duties, why not to baptism? Plainly, because they had been baptized already, and probably when the households of which they were members, like the household of the jailer, Lydia, Stephanas, and others, had been collectively received into the Church by the administration of this ordinance. Add to this, that although during the lifetime of the apostles there must have been in the Church many thousands of members, who had descended from Christian parents and grown to maturity, we never read in the New Testament of one of these descendants being baptized at an adult age. What is the irresistible inference? That such persons had been baptized in their infancy.

To this reasoning, which, to our minds, is conclusive and satisfactory, our Anti-pædobaptist brethren have one answer—

that the baptism of infant children is not expressly and positively enjoined. To which we reply, Can our opponents adduce one text of Scripture where the baptism of infants is forbidden? Not one. The duty to baptize them, if not expressed, is implied, and there was no need for it to be formally expressed, because the principle was already in force, and in universal practice, too, by the whole Jewish nation. Had that principle been repealed, the baptism of infants would have been formally forbidden; but if that principle were continued, there was no need to enjoin in words what was both known as one of the clearest truths, and practised as one of the most obvious duties, and prized as one of the most precious privileges. Indeed, custom, duty, right, relation, covenant, and unrepealed commands, combined with all the natural and religious instincts of the Jew to induce him to have his children baptized with himself, unless some special prohibition had resisted him; and such a resistance, had there been one, would have been to him one of the most repulsive elements in the Christian system, as a narrowing of his privileges, a divesting him of his sacred rights, and a casting out at once of his children from the visible Church and covenant of God. But there was no such prohibition. Sacrifices and offerings were done away, the priesthood was abolished, the temple service was abrogated; but these were compensated for by higher privileges and more abundant blessings. Had the relation of infant children to the Church and covenant of God been abolished, there was no compensation for this! It would have been a vast abridgment of privilege, an unmitigated and irreparable loss, and a change, too, in the essential principles of the Gospel. But there was no such abolition of privilege, because there was no change in the covenant; and there *could not* be a change of covenant, because it was based on principles that are in their very nature immutable as the God who had ordained them; and because there could be no change in the principles on which the covenant was based, it follows that the position of children, in relation to Christ and the Church, remained the same in the Christian dispensation as it had been in the Jewish. Circumcision gave place to baptism only by the substitution of one ordinance for another, but having the same spiritual import, securing the same privileges, recognizing the same relation to Christ and his people,

and therefore the ordinance of recognition was performed on the same subjects—adult believers and their children.

Having thus based the ordinance on its Scriptural foundation, and noticed the practice of the apostles, let us for a moment look at the example of the ancient Church as we descend from apostolic times. Justin Martyr was born in the first century, and suffered death in the second, and his language implies that infant baptism was the practice of that early age. Irenæus lived also in the second century; he knew Polycarp, who was a disciple of St John, and was appointed by him to be Bishop of Smyrna; and he shows that the baptism of infants was the practice of the Church in apostolic times.*

* Καὶ πολλοί τινες καὶ πολλαὶ ἐξηκοντουται καὶ ἑβδομηκοντοῦται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένουσι.—Justin Martyr, Apol. 1.

'Many persons among us, of both sexes, who are sixty and seventy years old, and who were made disciples from their childhood, continue uncorrupted.'

Magister ergo existens magistri quoque habebat ætatem. Non reprobans nec supergrediens hominem, neque solvens suam legem in se humani generis; sed omnem ætatem sanctificans per illam quæ ad ipsum erat similitudinem. Omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare; omnes inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores. Irenæus adv. Hæres., lib. 2.

'As he was a master, he had therefore the age of a master. He neither regarded human nature with disdain, nor violated the law of humanity in himself; but he sanctified every age by taking up in his own person the likeness of every age; for he came to save all persons by himself. All persons, I say, who are regenerated unto God by him; infants, and little ones, and children, and young men, and elder persons.'

Here we have children, young children, and even infants, spoken of as 'regenerated' (*renascuntur*), and their regeneration, as set forth by Irenæus, evidently implies their baptism; for by what other sign or evidence were infants recognized as 'regenerated,' and distinguished from the unregenerated? It was not by their repentance, or their faith, or their good works, for infants were not capable of these conditions. But infants were capable of baptism, even as Jewish children were capable of circumcision; and having received the rite of baptism, the seal of God's covenant was upon them, and they were recognized as being 'regenerated,' and distinguished by this term from others who were not baptized; nor was the term 'regenerated' applied to any infant children except to those who had been baptized. This proves the point as to infant baptism being practised by the Church in the early period of Irenæus.

The word ἐμαθητεύθησαν, as applied to children by Justin, we regard as being used by him in a similar sense, for how could little children be made disciples without the initiatory rite of baptism; it being apostolic usage to admit none to discipleship but by the performance of that rite? And as these disciples were made such when children, and had retained their purity of character for sixty and seventy years, we have here evidence of their recognition as disciples by baptism in their childhood, and also of that rite being performed on children in apostolic times; for sixty or seventy years traced backwards bring us to the apostolic age.

Origen, an eminent writer and an indefatigable labourer, who flourished in the third century, affirms that the custom of baptizing infants was received from Christ and his apostles.* Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, lived in the third century, and from his writings we learn that infants were recognized by baptism as members of the Church in that age.† A question having arisen in his time as to whether or not baptism should be administered to children before the eighth day after their birth, it was referred to a synod held in Africa (A.D. 254), when sixty-six bishops were present, who decided that it was not necessary to defer the ordinance until that day.‡ St Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, who wrote in the fourth century, teaches, 'that the baptism of infants had been practised in apostolic times, and by the Church down to that time.'§ St Chrysostom, the celebrated orator and patriarch of Constantinople, who died in the year 407, constantly assumes that the Catholic (or universal) Church everywhere holds that infants should be baptized. Indeed, so uniform and universal had been the practice, that St Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo, who died in 430, says, that 'he never read or heard of any Christian, catholic or sectary, but who maintained that infants were to be baptized.' ‖ The origin of the doctrine and practice he ascribes to apostolic authority.¶ One writer there was, and only one, among the ancients—namely, Tertullian (he

If most of the apostles were dead at that period, the Apostle John was certainly then living, and he survived a number of years after that time.

* 'Pro hoc et ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare.' And according to this the Church received from the apostles a tradition to give baptism even to infants. Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. lib. 5. See also Origen on Levit. c. 12, and on Luke.

† Cyp., Epis. lix.

‡ Cyp., Epis. lxiv.

§ Amb. Com. on St Luke.

‖ De Pec. Mor., cap. vi.

¶ 'Et si quisquam in hâc re Divinam autoritatem quærat; quanquam quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum sed semper retentum est, non nisi autoritate apostolica traditum rectissime creditur; tamen veraciter conjicere possumus quid valeat in parvulis baptismi sacramentum ex circumcisione carnis quam prior populus accepit.'

And if any one should inquire what Divine authority there is in this thing, though what the universal Church holds, and has not originated in any councils, but was always maintained, is most properly believed to have been derived solely from apostolical authority; yet we may indeed consider also how much the sacrament of baptism avails for infants, by the circumcision of the flesh, which the former people (the Jews) received. St August. de Baptismo contra Donatistas, lib. 4, c. 15.

died about 245), who opposed infant baptism, but he never controverted the antiquity of the practice, and even he would allow infants to be baptized if in danger of death. So feeble, indeed, were his objections, and so limited their influence, that his opinion seemed to be quite forgotten in the time of St Augustine. Such is the unbroken testimony of antiquity as to the universal prevalence of this doctrine from the time of the apostles, that Wall, in his 'History of Infant Baptism,' affirms that Peter Bruis, a Frenchman, who lived in the eleventh century (about 1030), is the first Anti-pædobaptist teacher who had a regular congregation, and his followers were called Petrobrussians. The Anabaptists arose in Germany in the beginning of the fifteenth century; but, according to Bishop Tomline, it does not appear that there was any congregation of them in England till the year 1640. From these facts it is evident that the rejection of infant baptism is a modern thing; while, unauthorized by Holy Scripture, it is unsanctioned by antiquity. The Episcopal Church of England, the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, the Independents, the various sections of Methodists, the Lutheran Church, the Helvetian Church, the French Reformed Church, the Moravians, the Greek Church, and the Church of Rome, all baptize infant children, and trace the doctrine and practice up to the verge of the apostolic age, and base the duty and the privilege on the immutable authority of God.

IV. The Mode of Baptism.—In deciding this question, we shall not bewilder the reader by introducing quotations from Jewish Rabbis to show the various modes of baptism among the Jews, nor by prolonged and elaborate criticisms as to the diversified meanings of the word *baptize*. All these have had our careful examination, but we are persuaded that the decision of this question lies much nearer to the reach of a common-sense view of the subject, aided by the obvious teaching of Holy Scripture, than is commonly supposed. To us it appears certain that, in apostolic times, the mode of administering baptism was not deemed a matter of importance, and that it was diversified—sometimes immersion, but more frequently sprinkling or pouring, being practised by the apostles and primitive Christians; and assuredly this latter mode meets the requirements and realizes the design of the ordinance, and has clearly the sanction of both reason and Scripture. For—

1. Baptism is a rite enjoined upon all nations, and sprinkling or pouring is adapted to all climates and countries, but immersion is not; for how could immersion be practised in countries where, for six months in the year, every pond, stream, river, and ocean is converted into solid ice? And if immersion is not practicable because of natural impossibilities, how can it be obligatory?

2. Baptism is a duty devolving upon persons of all ages and in all conditions of life—the infant and the hoary-headed, the healthy and the infirm. Sprinkling or pouring is adapted to all ages and to all states of health, but immersing the whole body is not. Suppose a heathen to be converted when he is very old and infirm, or when reduced and enfeebled by sickness, so as to be near the approach of death, and he feels it a duty to be baptized: in such a case baptism by sprinkling is perfectly easy and safe; but baptism by immersion, or plunging the whole body under water, might cause instant death. If, therefore, such a mode is not practicable, how can it be required by God as a duty?

3. Sprinkling or pouring comports with decency and propriety; but, under some circumstances, the immersion of the whole body under water would not be becoming. Take the case of the thousands who must have been assembled together when there went out unto John 'all the land of Judæa, and they were all baptized of him'—Mark i. 5; and, again, the still greater multitudes when our Lord, by the agency of his disciples, made and baptized more disciples than John.—John iv. 1. The thousands who then went to be baptized must have consisted of mixed multitudes of men and women of various ages. We ask, Could those males and females, assembled together in the open air, have submitted to the exposure involved in the process of undressing and dressing, and being plunged under water in each other's presence? Could such a process be submitted to now in our own country? Would such a proceeding comport with English notions of propriety? If not, how could it in the Jewish nation, where the persons of females were far more private and reserved? How, then, could the pure and refined religion of Christianity require that as a duty which modesty forbids to be practised?

4. In some recorded instances the process of baptism by

immersion was not possible within the short time specified. Thus, on the day of Pentecost, there were three thousand persons baptized, besides the other exercises of prayer, preaching, exhortation, &c., and that after the day was part gone. Now, if we consider how long a time must necessarily have been preoccupied in devotional services, in distinguishing and separating the candidates for baptism, in their preparatory inquiries, in suitable religious instructions and exhortations by the apostles, and then the process of undressing, preparing for baptism, and dressing again, we shall perceive it to have been impossible to perform the ceremony by immersion on *three thousand persons* during that day. Even sprinkling or pouring would occupy all the time; but the idea of so many people being immersed over head, one by one, in so short a time, requires more credulity than we have a conscience to demand. Besides, these people did not come prepared for bathing; they had no bathing-dresses with them. Were they, then, plunged over head in their usual clothing? If not, were they unclothed for the purpose, and that amid thousands of spectators in a crowded city? Is not the supposition utterly forbidden by facts and by all propriety, especially by that religion which is the very essence of modesty?

5. There is no command to administer the ordinance of baptism by immersion. The duty of baptizing with water is commanded; but, like the Lord's Supper, the mode of its administration is left undecided by any positive precept. Assuredly, the meanings of the words *βάπτω* and of its derivative *βαπτίζω*, are too diversified to authorize any one to dogmatize as to the mode of this ordinance. True, the word means 'to dip' or 'to immerse;' but it means also 'to stain a vesture with blood,' Rev. xix. 13; 'to wet the body with dew,' Dan. iv. 25, in Sept. ver.; 'to dye, tinge, or imbue;' 'to wash the body by the affusion of water;' 'to pour water on the hands;' and 'to sprinkle.' In various important passages the word cannot possibly mean to dip or plunge; but to sprinkle is evidently the meaning. Thus, the Pharisees are said to have held traditions from their fathers about the baptisms of cups, and pots, and beds, *κλινῶν*.—Mark vii. 4. Now, although a man might baptize a cup or a pot by dipping it into water, surely he would not baptize his bed by dipping it into water,

especially if he had immediately after to lie down or recline upon it. Such ceremonies, indeed, being used for religious purification, and not as ordinary washings, required the use of only a few drops of water, and sprinkling was all that was needed. Thus again, Paul says that all the Israelites 'were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.'—1 Cor. x. 2. Now, how were all the Israelites baptized in or by the cloud? Were they all plunged into it? Impossible: for they are all said by the Apostle to have been '*under* the cloud' (*ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην*). If, therefore, they were under the cloud, they must have been baptized by its dews or drops falling upon them, while it was spread like a canopy over their heads. How were all the Israelites baptized in the sea? Was it by being all plunged or immersed beneath its waters? Assuredly not; for the Lord divided the sea, in order that they might be saved from being dipped, and might go over as on dry ground.—Exod. xiv. But though the Israelites were not dipped or plunged into the sea, they were doubtless sprinkled by the spray which the powerful wind raised from the surface of the crested waves, and in this sense they were baptized.

6. Baptism is a symbol of the Holy Spirit's influence, and the mode of administering the ordinance is evidently alluded to in the symbolic phraseology which the Holy Spirit itself had used. Now what is that symbolic phraseology? Is it dipping or plunging? No; but pouring, sprinkling, shedding, and washing. Thus: 'I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh;' 'And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit.'—Joel ii. 28; Acts ii. 18. 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.'—Ezek. xxxvi. 25. 'So shall he sprinkle many nations.'—Isa. lii. 15. Now here are allusions to several modes of using water for purification—pouring, shedding, and sprinkling—all emblematical of the Spirit's cleansing influence, and all conforming to the mode in which the Holy Spirit was actually given. He was not given by immersing, dipping, or plunging the disciples therein, but by descending, coming down, being shed upon them, and by resting on them, like sprinklings or quivering scintillations of fire. Even when '*washing*' is referred to as a symbol of the Spirit's influence, the 'washing' is not set forth by immersion or dipping, but by 'shedding' or

'pouring.' Thus we are said to be saved according to God's mercy 'by the WASHING of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he SHED on us abundantly.'—Titus iii. 5, 6. 'Having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath SHED forth this, which ye now see and hear.'—Acts ii. 33. Hence it follows, that shedding, pouring, and sprinkling must be acceptable modes of baptism, for they are sanctioned by the Holy Spirit himself.

7. It is alleged by immersionists that John baptized in Jordan and Ænon, where there was much water. True; John exercised his ministry, not in the synagogues or the temple, but in the wilderness or open country near to Jordan; and if the multitudes of people must be baptized, they must, of course, go to the place where John was located. At Ænon, also, John exercised his ministry; and the fact that there was much water there shows, not that he practised immersion, but that he chose a place adapted to his office, and to the multitudes who came thither for baptism; for if he had chosen a place where there was no water, he could not have baptized at all; and if he had chosen a place where there was but little water, the many people he had to baptize would have caused the water to be exhausted, or to become too muddy for use. The place, therefore, where there was much water, or many waters—perhaps several streams—would be the best adapted for his ministry, though sprinkling or pouring were the mode of using it.

8. It is further alleged, that Jesus is set forth as being baptized *in* Jordan, and as afterwards coming up straightway out of the water; and it is inquired, Does not such a representation imply immersion? We think not. Such language expresses just nothing as to the mode of baptism. The preposition εἰς, which is rendered '*in*,' means '*to*' or '*at*,' and is very often used in this sense. Thus, when it is said of Jesus that he went up *into* a mountain, the same preposition (εἰς) is used; but every one knows the meaning is, that Jesus went '*to*' or '*on*' the mountain, not into its inside. Nor need we contend for even this; for Jordan had an outer bank, and the bed of the river in the dry season was far within, and a person approaching the stream for any purpose might be said to be in Jordan; and, indeed, the Saviour might be not only at the margin of the stream, but even standing within its waters, and

yet not be immersed or plunged over head, for this position might naturally be used as the most convenient one for receiving the ordinance by sprinkling or affusion.

9. But is it not said that when Philip baptized the eunuch they both went down into the water; and when the ceremony was completed, they came up out of the water?—Acts viii. 38, 39. Of course, when they were both up in the chariot together, they must come down to get to the water; and if they got down to the water, which would naturally be in a low or hollow part, they must ascend when they returned from it. But the text does not say that they took off their clothes, as they must have done if they both plunged underneath the water. They went down to the water, and perhaps they stood in it, near its margin, for the sake of convenience (the same preposition—*εἰς*, *to*—is used in this instance); but as not a word is said about undressing before the ceremony, or of dressing again after it, we are left to presume there was no need for such operations, and that the ceremony was performed by sprinkling or pouring, in accordance with God's own words—'I will sprinkle clean water upon you,' or 'I will pour out my Spirit upon you.'

10. But, finally, is it not said by the Apostle Paul, 'We are buried with him (Christ) by baptism into death?' &c.—Rom. vi. 4. Certainly the Apostle does thus speak. Yet, in the next verse, the same Apostle speaks of believers being 'planted together in the likeness of Christ's death,' which has no resemblance to immersion; for planting implies an upright position, such as is used in receiving the ordinance by sprinkling or pouring. But, supposing that in the figure of our being 'buried with Christ by baptism,' there should be an allusion to the mode of baptism as having a resemblance to our Lord's lying in the tomb, it is probable that immersion was sometimes practised in solitary cases of baptism even in apostolic times. If this be so, the facts before us show that we have allusions to three modes of baptism—sprinkling, pouring, and immersion; and what is the rational conclusion from all the evidence before us? We think the following propositions are clear:—

1. That any one of the three modes of administering the rite of baptism is lawful.

2. That sprinkling or pouring has the sanction of Scriptural authority, as a mode under which the Holy Spirit represents his holy influences on the soul—'I will sprinkle clean water upon you.'
3. That in this mode of applying water, baptism answers the instructive purposes for which the ordinance was appointed.
4. That this mode is adapted to all ages, all countries, and all circumstances.
5. That probably this was the most frequent mode in which baptism was administered in apostolic times, especially when the great multitudes were baptized by John, by the Saviour, and by the apostles on the day of Pentecost.
6. That, seeing several modes of baptism are lawful, the choice may be left to expediency or propriety, and that, therefore, all angry controversy on such a question should for ever cease.

'Peace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ.'

From the nature and the subjects of baptism, one or two reflections arise.

Baptism ought always to be administered in public; for, as it is designed by God to be a *public* proclamation of great truths, and a means of perpetuating them, we contravene God's purpose when we voluntarily practise baptism privately. Therefore, unless affliction or some special providence prevent, let the ordinance be always performed at a public service, in God's own sanctuary, on God's own day, and within the sight and hearing of the whole congregation of God's own people.

As both father and mother stand in the same natural relation to their children, and are bound by the same obligations and duties, and are under the same responsibilities to God, they ought both to be present before God and his people at the baptism of their offspring; and both ought to take part in this solemn profession of their faith in God and his covenant, and in the dedication of their children to God. It is pitiful to see the mother left alone in this ordinance, deserted by her husband, as if he were a heathen or an infidel, or else as if he were ashamed of publicly owning his family and his God.

The privilege of bringing our children to be baptized in

God's name involves the duty of training them up for God. Having the sign and seal of God's covenant upon them, and being dedicated to God's service, they should be early instructed in the knowledge of God and his holy Word, and by a thoroughly religious education, a holy example, and earnest prayer, be brought, so soon as reason dawns, to the experimental enjoyment of salvation.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE Divine authority of this ordinance is so clear and decisive as to place it almost beyond the possibility of controversy, the dissentients being so few in number as to form but a trifling exception to its universal recognition. No language can be more direct and positive than that employed by our Lord in the institution of this ordinance, enforced, too, with special emphasis, and blending authority with love in the command, 'Do this in remembrance of me.' In proof that this duty was not one of limited and temporary, but of universal and perpetual obligation, it was re-enforced by St Paul, many years afterwards, with a fulness of detail and a solemnity of manner that mark the gravity of its import—'For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the *same* night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks, be brake *it*, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also *he took* the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come.' —1 Cor. xi. 23—26. An ordinance so clearly Divine in its origin admits of no question as to its authority, and no evasion as to its obligation. We proceed, therefore, at once to consider the design of this sacred ordinance.

1. *It is commemorative of a great fact—the death of the Lord Jesus Christ.*—As the central fact of the great redeeming

economy, there was a necessity that the death of Christ should ever stand out in prominent relief before the Church; and God has effectually provided for this. From the foundation of the world, Christ's death was vividly set forth to the believing anticipation of the Church by the slaughtered victims of holy sacrifice; and when anticipation was turned into fact by the actual death of Christ, it was equally necessary that the memory of this great fact should be perpetuated by some suitable memorial down to the end of time. And what commemoration so suitable in itself, and so simple in its observance, as the appointed ordinance? The broken bread represents the Redeemer's broken body; the wine symbolizes his shed blood; and the act of eating and drinking thereof testifies at once our personal belief in the fact and our participation in its saving benefits. Thus, the ordinance becomes both a precious means of grace and the permanent memorial of a great truth; and the memorial itself becomes an ever-speaking evidence of that truth on which our hopes of salvation are founded; so that, while the ordinance is observed, the truth can never be forgotten, and the evidence of its reality can never cease to be attested; for it shows forth the Lord's death till he come.

2. *The ordinance is the proclamation of a fundamental doctrine*—THE ATONEMENT OF CHRIST.—Hence it concentrates our attention, not on the life, but on the death of our Lord; and it assigns the special object and attests the special efficacy of his death. It is not merely the death of a patriot, or of a martyr, or an exemplar, but of a sacrifice, and a sacrifice atoning for sin, that we are to remember. Hence, while the broken bread represents his bruised body, and the wine his shed blood, it is expressly added that the blood was 'shed for the remission of sins.' The atonement is the fundamental doctrine of the Christian system; and to conserve and publish it through all ages, he has incorporated it in this precious ordinance; so that, so long as we 'remember' Christ in the use of this sacrament, and pronounce the significant words he himself uttered in appointing the ordinance, we cannot but 'remember' him as a sacrificial victim, whose blood was 'shed for the remission of sins,' for we thereby proclaim him the Atoning Saviour of mankind.

3. *The ordinance is a commemoration of infinite love.*—It is

the love of Christ, not only as man, but as the Incarnate God; love, not to the innocent and the holy, but to the guilty, the rebellious, the malignant; love, not only undeserved, but unsought, and undesired; love exhibited, not simply in some beneficent deed, but in death; and that death not an ordinary one, but the death of the cross—the most shameful, painful, and lingering death that could be endured. This death he suffered for us. Herein is love—boundless, unutterable love. This we are to contemplate while we break the hallowed bread and drink the sacred cup. In tones of tenderness, he says, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'

4. *This ordinance is a sign and a seal of God's covenant with man.*—The purpose of a covenant is essentially included in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; for the term 'covenant' was expressly used by our Lord at its institution; and when the ordinance is referred to in the Scriptures, this term is repeated: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι —'this cup is the NEW COVENANT in my blood.' The covenant is that of redemption; and 'new' as distinguished from the old covenant of works, and from the Jewish dispensation, now abrogated; 'new,' as the last dispensation of grace to man; and 'new,' as retaining unchanging freshness and efficacy. Such being the purpose of the ordinance, the elements of bread and wine, used in its participation, are the appointed signs or symbols of his body bruised, and of his blood shed, attesting the fulfilment of his part of the covenant; and the seals, or visible ratification of his fidelity and love in the actual bestowment of all the blessings of his covenant, on all those who accept that covenant by faith.

5. *This ordinance is a badge of discipleship with Christ.*—As baptism is the initiatory rite by which a disciple is admitted within the pale of the Church, so the observance of the Lord's Supper, with seasonable frequency, is the chief ritual condition of our continued membership in the Church of Christ; for the wilful neglect of this ordinance, when regarded as a duty, is tantamount to a rejection or despising of Christ's authority, and a voluntary renunciation of the privileges of connection with his visible Church. For the same reason, no denomination which rejects the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper is entitled to be regarded as a Christian Church.

6. *This ordinance is a means for the communion of saints.*—Hence it is written, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread' (1 Cor. x. 16, 17); that is, while our partaking of the bread and wine is a sign of our union with Christ, and of our personal participation in the blessings purchased by his death, it is also a symbol of our mutual faith in Christ, and of our mutual relation to him as our Saviour; of our union with each other as members of the same Body; and of our mutual obligation to sympathy and love.

This ordinance ought to be observed—

1. *With sincerity.*—We may not insist on a state of conscious salvation as an essential qualification for approaching the Lord's table, but there must be at least a sincere and earnest desire for that salvation, evinced by true sorrow for sin, and an utter renunciation of it; for to partake of this ordinance with the love of sin in our heart, is to eat and drink unworthily, and thereby incur condemnation. Hence the command, 'Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.'

2. *In charity with all men.*—In this ordinance we have an astounding display of love; therefore all hatred, revenge, and malignity must be put away. Every enemy must be freely and fully forgiven; no secret grudge must be cherished; the heart must open its benevolent affections towards all mankind; otherwise we insult the Redeemer, and desecrate his holy ordinance. 'Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast: not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.'

3. *With an appropriating faith in Christ.*—Not merely a faith which assents to the great truths of the Christian religion, for that is not enough; nor a faith in some mysterious efficacy in the elements, for that is deceptive: but a faith which looks through the ordinance to Christ himself as our personal Saviour; a faith which 'discerns the Lord's body' as crucified for me individually, and rests upon him solely and

fully for salvation; and by which, putting our finger upon the print of the nails, we may exclaim, 'My Lord and my God.'

4. *With personal consecration to God.*—In this ordinance Christ is set forth crucified for us, giving himself up for our redemption; and, in partaking of the elements, we formally avow the obligation of accepting his covenant, and dedicating ourselves to him, fully, unreservedly, and for ever. 'Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.'

5. *With joyous anticipations, exulting in the certainty of his second coming, and in the prospect of being eternally with him.*—For in this ordinance 'ye show the Lord's death until he come.'

As to the mode of receiving the ordinance, whether in the posture of sitting or kneeling; whether by the use of leavened or unleavened bread; whether when fasting or not fasting; and whether it be received weekly, monthly, or less frequently, no law is given, and individuals and churches are left to determine for themselves. Such questions are of minor importance, and ought never to become matters of angry dispute or separation.

Transubstantiation.—Of all the monstrous perversions of truth exhibited by the folly or malignity of man, there is none to surpass that which the Church of Rome has displayed in the dogma of transubstantiation, in which she affirms, 'Whosoever shall deny that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his soul and divinity, and, consequently, Christ entire; but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign and figure, or by his power, let him be accursed.'—Council of Trent, Canon I.

The bare mention of this dogma would seem sufficient for its refutation with all reasonable minds; yet, as a preservative against so fatal a delusion into which multitudes have fallen, by the sophisms of a deceived or interested priesthood, it may be proper to expose its contradictions and absurdities.

1. It is unscriptural. The words of our Lord, which are appealed to for the sanction of this dogma, disprove it. When the Redeemer broke the bread and said, 'This is my body,' he did not speak literally, else would his language make the cup

itself, not the wine that was in it, to be his own very blood; for, holding the cup in his hand, he said, 'This cup is my blood.' But the Romanists themselves will not admit this, and in not admitting this they depart from the literal meaning of the words. In this they do right, but consistency and equity require them to exercise the same common sense in the interpretation of the other words of our Lord. If the cup does not literally mean his blood, neither does the bread literally mean his body. Besides, the words of our Lord are uttered in the present tense; he says, 'This is my body,' but these words, if taken literally, would assert that the piece of bread he then held in his hand was, at the same instant, his own body; so that either he held himself in his own hand, which is false from its impossibility, or that he had that moment, while speaking to them, changed himself into a piece of bread, which is false from its absurdity. While this profane dogma changes the solemn words of Christ into nonsense, it transforms a multitude of other texts into unintelligible jargon; for, on the same perverse principle, every similar phrase in which God is compared to any object, transubstantiates him into that object. Thus it makes God literally a sun, a shield, a rock, a fortress, and a buckler, because the Psalmist compares him to such objects; and Christ transubstantiates himself not only into a piece of bread, but literally into a door, a vine, a fountain, a lion, a stone, or any other object to which he is compared. Away with such perversions. They degrade our reason, they distort God's Word; they change his truth into a lie. Interpret our Lord's words as we interpret other parts of Holy Scripture, and the meaning is as clear as daylight. They teach simply that the bread represents his body, and the wine his blood, and, therefore, are appropriate symbols to be used in the commemoration of his death. The same principle of interpretation applies to our Lord's words in John vi., where he declares himself to be 'the bread of life,' and says that his 'flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed.' The grossness of a literal meaning is removed by our Lord himself, when he immediately affirms in explanation of his words, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you are spirit and life.'

2. Transubstantiation is not only opposed to Scripture, but

is a monstrous contradiction to the evidence of our senses. We are to believe, first, that our Lord changed himself into a piece of bread, although the disciples saw at the same moment the Saviour's person before them unchanged, and the bread and wine totally unaltered; and then we are to believe that a priest, by pronouncing a few words in Latin, changes the bread and wine into the body and blood, soul and divinity of Christ; and yet the bread and wine remain unaltered in quantity, weight, colour, shape, taste, odour, and every other property. That is to say, the priest first makes his God and then eats him; and yet that God is nothing more to his senses than bread and wine before he is eaten, has nothing but the taste of bread and wine when he is eaten, and differs in nothing from so much other common material food after he is chewed and swallowed into the human stomach. Nothing in all the lying wonders of heathenism or Mahometanism makes such an enormous demand upon our credulity.

To all this it is answered, 'We are not to believe our senses, for they deceive us.' But if our senses are not to be believed, how does the priest himself know that any such passage as 'This is my body' is contained in Scripture? If he does not believe his own senses, he does not know even this; but if he does know it, he believes his senses; and if he believes his senses, he thereby refutes his own statement, and justifies our rejection of his foolish dogma. It is doubtful whether the Romish priests themselves can believe in a dogma so utterly repugnant to reason and the evidence of sense. A priest having consecrated and transubstantiated a wafer, was informed, before he took it, that the wafer contained arsenic. It was enough. Although he had previously affirmed that no part of the natural substance remained, but the whole had been changed into the body and blood, and soul and divinity of our Lord, yet he declined to eat it—a clear evidence that he did not believe in the transubstantiation he professed to inculcate. He had prudence, however, if not faith, for history informs us of some who have been poisoned through the elements being drugged.

3. The doctrine of transubstantiation is historically known to be a human invention. We have already seen that it has no support from Scripture, and it is easy to show that it was

not held by the ancient Church. Although some of the early fathers used bold and metaphorical language in speaking of the Eucharist, yet they never condemn such views as are now held by Protestants, but assert, as we do, that the bread and wine were only symbols and figures of the body and blood of our Lord. Tertullian, quoting Christ's words, 'This is my body,' says, that is, '*the figure* of my body.'* Justin Martyr says, 'The bread of the Eucharist was a *figure*.'† Origen affirms, 'If you take this according to the letter, "Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood," this letter killeth.'‡ Clemens Alexandrinus declares that our Lord spoke *allegorically* when he said, 'Take, drink, this is my blood, the blood of the vine.'§ Cyprian speaks of 'the wine that *represents* the blood of Christ.'‖ Eusebius speaks of the bread and wine as 'the *symbols* of his body and healthful blood.'¶ Macarius characterizes 'the bread and wine the *antitype* of his flesh and blood.'** Augustine, adverting to the words of Christ, 'Unless ye eat my flesh,' &c., says, 'This passage, according to the rule I have laid down, is a *figure*.'†† Cyril of Jerusalem says, 'Under the *type* of bread his body is given unto thee; and under the *type* of wine his blood is given unto thee.'‡‡ Jerome speaks also of the wine as 'a type of Christ's blood.'§§ Gregory Nazianzen, and Ambrose, advert to the elements in the sacrament as 'figures of the body and blood of Christ.'‖‖ Theodoret, Gelasius, and Facundus, speak with equal clearness of the elements as *symbols* and *similitudes* of Christ's body and blood.

These writers bring us down to the sixth century, when we come into the dark ages, and then monstrous errors and delusions were rapidly propagated and easily believed. Yet, so late as the year 754, in the general council held at Constantinople, it was declared that the sacrament was but a type. Thirty-three years afterwards, however, the second Council of Nice (787) denied this, and vaguely declared that, in the

* Tertul. Opera, Adv. Marcion, lib. iv. c. 40.
† Just. Mart. con. Tryp. ‡ Orig. Opera, tom. ii. cap. 5.
§ Clemen. Alex. Opera, tom. i. lib. ii. ‖ Cypriani Oper., Epist. 63.
¶ Euseb. Opera, Demonst. Evang., lib. viii. cap. 1. ** Hom. XXVI.
†† Aug. Opera, tom. iii. De Doct. Christ., lib. iii.
‡‡ Cyril. Oper. Cat. xxii. Mystag. iv. sect. iii. §§ Hieron. Opera, Ad. Jovin.
‖‖ Greg. Naz., Orat. ii. in Pasch. Amb. Oper., tom. iii. De Sacr., lib. iv. cap. 5.

sacrament, 'there is properly Christ's body and blood.' Even after this decree opinions varied, and the dogma was controverted by intelligent men, including even bishops, cardinals, and popes; but the Lateran Council (1215) finally determined that transubstantiation should be the doctrine of the Church. At the Council of Trent (1542) the dogma was confirmed, and in the seventeenth century it was accepted by the Greek Church. Thus transubstantiation is an innovation. Even the word transubstantiation was not invented until the year 1100, and not a few eminent Romanists confess that the thing itself is not to be found in the Word of God. Johannes Scotus admits the want of Scriptural evidence in its support. Erasmus could find no certain Scriptural declaration in its favour. Even Bellarmin grants the probability of this statement. Cardinal Alliaco maintains that the opinion that the bread and wine retain their own substance is not unscriptural, and is more easy and rational than the contrary. Cajetan says that 'transubstantiation is not expressly taught in the Gospel;' 'the true presence in the mass,' says Fisher, 'cannot be proved from the words of the institution;' and similar concessions have been made by Occam, Alphonsus, Cantarero, Durand, and Vasquesius. Indeed, Albertin has enumerated thirty Roman pontiffs, cardinals, bishops, or commentators, who interpret the words 'eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood' in a spiritual, and not in a literal sense.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE HOLY ANGELS.

The existence of celestial beings, distinct from human spirits, and occupying a more elevated state than man in his present condition, is everywhere taught in the sacred Scriptures. Their existence, their presence, and active agency, are seen historically in all God's past dispensations, and in all prophetic representations of the future, down to the end of time, and in that eternity of blessedness which shall follow the judgment-day. Indeed, in nearly all the systems of religion, ancient or modern, we trace such beings; in the Æons of the Gnostics, the De-

mons, the Demi-gods, the Genii, and the Lares, which figure so largely in the theogonies, poems, and general literature of heathen antiquity, we have abundant evidence of almost universal belief in the existence of spiritual intelligences, ranging in different orders between man and his Maker. Here, however, we often find truth draped in fiction, and facts distorted by the wildest fancies of mythology.

The doctrine of the heathen, respecting spiritual beings, may be thus briefly stated. They believe the souls of departed heroes and good men were exalted to dignity and happiness; these were called demons, and were supposed to be employed as mediators between the supreme divinity and man. There was, however, another class of demons, who were supposed never to have inhabited mortal bodies at all; and of these, there were two sorts: the good, who were employed as the guardians of good men; and evil ones, who were said to envy human happiness, and sought to hinder their virtue and effect their ruin. In these notions we see a substratum of truth; but in the Scriptures we have the truth itself in its original purity, free from the corruptions of superstition and the licentious imagery of the poet; and truth the more majestic from its unadorned simplicity.*

It is evidence of that perfect wisdom, which pertains to inspiration, that while the Bible rarely touches on scientific subjects, and never unfolds to us the secrets of life in the planetary or stellar worlds, it treats largely on worlds invisible, and describes with great freeness and fulness the nature, attributes, employments, and condition of certain spiritual beings, which belong to that state and region of existence, into which we ourselves are to enter at death, and where we must live in happiness or woe during ages which have no end. The Bible is reserved in all matters of mere curiosity, lest man should squander his precious time in idle speculation; but abundant in the revelation of truths which exercise his faith, stimulate his moral faculties, and enkindle within him divine aspirations. Angels are our ministering spirits; how consoling to know this! Angels are examples of fidelity and obedience; how en-

* See Hesiod, Op. et Dies, lib. 1, 120. Platonis Sympos. p. 202, tom. 3, edit. Serrani. Apuleius de Deo Socratis, p. 674, 677, 690, edit. Delph. Plutarch de Defect. Orac., p. 431, tom. 2, edit. Paris, 1624; and Plut. Dion. in initio, p. 958, tom. 1.

couraging the triumphant issue of their trial! Angels are to be our companions for ever; how delightful and exhilarating the hope of their society! How wise and benevolent, then, the revelation which affords us the knowledge of their existence, their character, and their state! Great and glorious as are the other truths which the Book of God unfolds, yet would it be divested of much of its beauty and utility, if angels were not there. The presence and agency of those blest spirits illumines many a page, adds freshness and life to many an incident, and blends the pilgrimage of earth with the anticipated scenes of heaven.

1. *Angels have a conscious personal existence.*—Numerous and diversified as are the evidences of this in Holy Scripture, it is a melancholy proof of man's perversity that even this obvious truth is questioned. None but men of frigid hearts and sceptical brains, such as the Sadducees of old and the Priestleys of modern times, could resist the flood of evidence which the Pentateuch alone pours upon this truth.

Their usual appellation — *angel* (מַלְאָךְ and Ἄγγελος), means *messenger*, a name expressive of their office, and is of itself a proof of their personality. For, what is a messenger, but one who conveys and communicates a message from one intelligent being to another; and to receive and communicate a message, most evidently implies intelligence and voluntary agency; and intelligence and voluntary agency are the attributes of a conscious personal being. The same term is sometimes applied to apostles and ministers, and we never question their personality. It is sometimes applied in a pre-eminent sense to Christ, as the Messenger of God to man; and we cannot question his personality as essentially involved in his mission and his work. But if the term messenger involves personality in the mission of apostles, of ministers, and of Christ, it assuredly involves personality in angels, as the messengers of God.

The pages of Holy Writ are radiant with the visits of these celestial messengers; when tidings and revelations of the most important truths and facts were announced to man in the name of the most High God; and in every such message we have proof positive of the proper personality of those wonderful beings who brought their communications to mankind.

2. *Angels are spiritual beings.*—In the Old Testament the Psalmist calls them spirits—'*Who maketh his angels spirits*,' civ. 4. And in the New Testament they are designated by the same term—'*Are they not all ministering spirits?*' Heb. i. 14. Here, however, a question arises—are angels so spiritual as to be absolutely immaterial like God? or are they enshrined in a refined material fabric? Opinions both ancient and modern are much divided on this subject. Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nicene, Cyril, and Chrysostom held that angels are absolutely immaterial; but Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Cæsarius, and Tertullian, among the earlier fathers, thought those blessed beings were enshrined in a refined material fabric.

The term spirit, applied to them, does not of itself absolutely decide the question; for as that word in both Hebrew and Greek is primarily a material term, indicating wind, air, or breath, it may without violence be applied either to a pure spirit or to a refined material nature. It is true that, on the appearance of angels to man, they assumed a visible human form. This fact, however, does not prove their materiality; for human spirits in the intermediate state, though disembodied, have in their intercourse with man appeared in a material human form: on the Mount of Transfiguration Moses, as well as Elias, was recognized as a man; and the Elders who appeared to and conversed with John, in the Apocalypse, had also the human form.—Rev. v. 5, and vii. 13. Yet such appearances cannot absolutely decide the question.

Theologically, there is nothing incongruous or improbable in the supposition that angels are invested with a refined material nature. Heaven is undoubtedly suitable as a habitat for such. Enoch and Elijah were exalted body and soul to heaven by translation; the glorified humanity of our Lord is there enthroned; and angels, though enshrined in a material fabric, may dwell in the splendours of the Divine presence. It may be that angels were once incorporated in a physical organization, but are now disembodied, like human souls in the intermediate state; and, like them, are awaiting their final glorification. Or, it may be, they are already enjoying their full reward, and are enshrined in a glorified material fabric like that which the saints shall inherit on the morning of the resurrection.

Yet, as it is a law of adaptation, that no such gross materiality as 'flesh and blood' can enter that region of blessedness, it follows that if angels are enshrined in a material frame, it must be so refined in its nature as to exclude all that involves the possibility of decay, and any organization with animal appetites and wants. Our Lord himself has decided this, by affirming that human beings in heaven neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God.—Matt. xxii. 30. In this comparison between the final state of the righteous and the present state of angels, we have a glimpse of the condition of both. It invests our theme with augmented interest to know that the exalted beings with whom we are to live for ever, have a nature so much in common with our own; it is still more interesting to know that in the higher attributes of both, angels and men so much resemble the human nature of Christ.

3. *Angels are represented as existing in vast numbers.*—Had only one or two of these celestial messengers appeared to man, or had any phraseology been employed in Scripture to intimate that they were few, our interest in contemplating them would have been diminished; but our interest in them is intensified by the most explicit declarations that their number is immense. They are called God's hosts, his legions, and are said to consist of myriads of myriads. Hear what Micaiah says, 'I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left.'—1 Kings xxii. 19. Hear what David says, 'The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even many thousands of angels.'—Psal. lxviii. 17. Elisha saw one detachment of these celestial beings sent to be his bodyguard, when 'the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about him.'—2 Kings vi. 17. Hear what Daniel saw, 'Thousand thousands were ministering unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand were standing before him.'—Dan. vii. 10. Behold what the watchful shepherds saw and heard on the morn of the Redeemer's birth, 'A multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest.'—Luke ii. 13. Hear what Jesus says, 'Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?'—Matt. xxvi. 53. Look again at the magnificent spectacle which John saw and

heard as he gazed into the heavenly world, 'And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the living ones and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain,' &c.—Rev. v. 12. If these numbers be taken literally, they indicate 202 millions, yet they were only a part of the celestial host. It is probable, however, these figures were not intended to indicate any precise number, but that the multitude was immense, beyond what usually enters into human computation. Hence in Hebrews xii. 22, we read not of any definite or limited number, however great, but of 'an innumerable company of angels.'

4. *Angels are distinguished by different orders.*—God delights in variety, but it is the variety of order. We see this in all his works on earth, where variety is made subservient to utility and harmony; and as heaven is a place of greater dignity than earth, where sin is not permitted to establish anarchy and confusion, we might expect a boundless variety to co-exist with perfect harmony. Besides that variety which always marks the individual mind, we find various distinct orders indicated in the hierarchy of heaven.

ANGEL is the generic term including all orders, and is, as we have said, expressive not of their nature but of their office. The word 'archangel' occurs but twice in the sacred volume, 1 Thess. iv. 16, and Jude 9. It is used both times in the singular number; from which we learn that there is but one angelic being who bears this distinguished title, and he stands at the head of the celestial hierarchy. In Jude we find this exalted being is called by name 'MICHAEL the archangel.' Bishop Horsley and others have supposed the archangel to mean Christ himself, because he is said to be the head of all principality and power; but this conclusion is inadmissible. 'Michael the archangel' is said to have contended with the devil about the body of Moses, and durst not bring a railing accusation, but said, 'The Lord rebuke thee.' To apply this to our Lord seems simply ridiculous. See also 2 Peter ii. 11. The other passage, in 1 Thess. iv. 16, refers to the judgment, and says, 'The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God!' But

here, instead of our Lord being identical with the archangel, he is distinguished from him by the emphatic title 'the Lord himself,' as well as by that supremacy which distinguishes the eternal Judge from his ministering angel. As these are the only passages where the word archangel occurs, it follows that if they do not teach the identity of Christ with the archangel, it is not taught at all in the Scriptures, and the notion falls to the ground. The archangel is not 'the Lord himself,' but his chief messenger, the prince of all his celestial hosts.

Subordinate to this exalted being, we read of Cherubim, Seraphim, Living Ones, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers.

From the brevity and the designed obscurity of the few Scriptural representations of the various orders of angelic beings, it may be impossible to determine with certainty and exactness their specific distinction. A careful examination, however, of the several texts which speak of these exalted beings, may enable us to obtain imperfect glimpses as to their nature. Thus, by comparing Isaiah vi. 1—3 with 1 Kings vi. 23—28, Psalm lxxx. 1, and Ezekiel x. 1—22, it appears in the highest degree probable that the cherubim and the seraphim are the same order of celestial beings. Then, by comparing Ezekiel i. 3—28 with Ezekiel x. 1—22, we have the certainty of the prophet's own testimony that the 'living creatures' and the 'cherubim' are identical. Again, by comparing the 'living ones' in Revelation, chapters iv. and v., with 'the living creatures' in Ezekiel, chapters i. and x., we have next to a complete demonstration that they too are the same beings; for they are the same in number—four; they are identical in name—חַיּוֹת in Hebrew being the exact equivalents for τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα in Greek; and the emblematical representations of these remarkable beings, in both Ezekiel and John, approximate so near as to harmonize with their identity of nature. In every representation they are intimately near the Divine presence, next indeed to the supernal splendour which fills the holy place of the Most High; and in their worship of Jehovah they celebrate the holiness of the Divine character in the sublimest strains. They have wings wherewith reverently to cover their bodies in the Divine presence, and to fly in swift obedience to the Divine commands; and they have re-

spectively the likeness of the man, the eagle, the lion, and the ox, to indicate the same high qualities of wisdom, penetration, courage, and vigour, as the ministers of God. We thus arrive at the conclusion that the seraphim of Isaiah, the cherubim of Ezekiel, and the living ones of the Apocalypse, are representations of the same order of glorious beings.

Is it inquired, why then, if identical in nature, are they called by the different names of 'cherubim,' 'seraphim,' and 'living ones?' I reply, for the same reason that they are represented by various emblems. In translating celestial ideas into human speech, the inadequacy of human language is felt; and as no one word is adequate to express their various attributes, several terms are employed. They are called 'cherubim,' to indicate their exalted nature; 'seraphim,' to denote the ardour of their love and devotion; and 'living ones,' because they are instinct with divine life, intensely active, and of immortal existence.*

In addition to these appellations, we find the following terms applied to angelic beings—Thrones (*θρόνοι*), Dominions (*κυριότητες*), Principalities (*ἀρχαί*), Authorities (*ἐξουσίαι*), and Powers (*δυνάμεις*).† All these have their appropriate signification, and we know well enough their meaning when applied to earthly things, but here they apply to angels, and the difficulty, if not the impossibility, is to discover their exact meaning as applied to these celestial beings. The words doubtless indicate a real, not a nominal distinction, else would the apostle be chargeable with useless tautology. In these words we have the abstract put for the concrete: '*Thrones*,' for those who sit upon them; '*Dominions*,' for those who rule over them; '*Principalities*,' for those who govern them; '*Authorities*,' for those who are invested with them; and '*Powers*,' for those who exercise them. Thus the terms are all expressive of dignity

* The word cherubim is not a single word, but compounded of כ an adverbial prefix which means *like*, and the word רַב, which means a *great one*, a chief, a prince, or any one having pre-eminence, principality, or chiefdom. The word seraphim is from שָׂרַף, which means to burn. The Hebrew word for living ones is from חָיָה, *to live;* and the Greek *ζῶον* from *ζάω*, to live. Hence we see how these words, as nouns, are made to express the several attributes of greatness, ardent devotion, and life intensely active and immortal.

† Col. i. 16; Eph. i. 21; Col. ii. 10; 1 Peter iii. 22.

and honour, yet of gradation; for 'Thrones' are greater than 'Dominions,' and 'Principalities' are greater than 'Powers.' Hence we see arrangement and economy, order and subordination, are the law of heaven as well as of earth; and contribute to the welfare and happiness of both.

5. *Angels are beings of unspotted holiness.*—They are designated holy because their nature is without spot, and their lives without a stain of sin. They lament no depravity, because their nature is immaculate; they confess no sin, because they are unconscious of guilt; they implore no mercy, because they have violated no law; they deprecate no wrath, because they are under no condemnation; they fear no evil, for innocence has no danger to apprehend. They live in a region where no vile thing can enter, and they bask in the smile of Him whose favour is the consciousness of everlasting life.

They are called 'the elect angels,'—1 Tim. v. 21, which marks their distinction from others who have fallen; yet this implies not an antecedent and unconditional appointment to everlasting blessedness; but that once they were in a probationary state, and having passed it without being scathed, are now honoured and rewarded for their fidelity. The period of their trial having expired, they have entered upon another stage of existence higher than their former one, and now inherit the security derived from virtue proved, and honour won by arduous conflict. Living as they have done in the immediate presence of God for thousands of years, and all that time under influences which constantly invigorate holy principles, excite spiritual affections, and kindle divine aspirations, how ripe their attainments in the highest moral excellence; how intimate their communion with God; and how full-orbed and bright their reflection of his glorious image! See their sympathy with the Divine purposes as they move instinct with the Holy Spirit within them! See their reverence for Jehovah, as they profoundly bow, and veil their faces before his majesty! See their prompt obedience as they hasten with ready wing to do his will, and return; and contemplate their adoration as they utter their loud trisagion of praise, 'Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory.'

6. *Angels are beings of great benevolence.*—Benevolence springs from holiness, and love to others flows from love to

God. We wonder not therefore if universal harmony and good-will prevail among all the ranks of angelic hosts. But it strikes us as a remarkable evidence of overflowing benevolence, when we see their sympathies extending to worlds beyond their own sphere, and to a race of beings so distinct and distant from themselves. Man might be the brother of an angel, so tender is their love towards him; he might live within the suburbs of their own bright realms, so constant and unwearied their service for his good. When the Son of God came to redeem the world, they came to excite men to join the chorus of their exultation; and their congratulatory anthem of peace on earth, good-will to man, and glory to God in the highest, is with them a song that will never die. When man repents of his evil ways they gather up his tears as men would gather precious pearls, and their songs swell the joys of heaven in the hope of his final salvation. As the weary-footed pilgrim journeys through life's wilderness they minister in a thousand ways for his succour, comfort, and protection; when he dies they receive his departing spirit into their loving arms, and bear it in exultation to the throne of God; and through eternity they delight to advance him in knowledge and happiness, and to blend their voices with his in praises to God and the Lamb. This is not imagination, but reality; sober truth confirmed by facts recorded in God's word, which reveals a sympathetic benevolence in the minds of angels, so deep and so powerful that we may verily believe they would each cheerfully become incarnate like their Lord and die for man, if by that means they could rescue him from perdition, and secure his eternal salvation. The love they display for man is wonderful, and their example inculcates a most instructive lesson to us on the great duty of brotherly affection and help.

7. *Angels are beings of great intelligence.*—The face of man is one of their emblems to indicate their knowledge and wisdom: they are set forth as full of eyes, to denote their clear perception of truth, and their power of penetrating and surveying it on all sides. They are depicted as bending with outstretched wing and observant eye over the mercy-seat, to show their profound interest in man's redemption, and their devout contemplation of its mysteries. These are 'the things which angels desire to look into;' and they are said to derive much of

their sublime conceptions of Jehovah's perfections from the unfolding glories of the dispensation of grace. 'That now unto the principalities and powers in the heavenlies might be known through the Church the manifold wisdom of God,' Ephes. iii. 10. These are interesting discoveries to us of the capacities of angelic minds, the habit of angelic thought, and their mode of acquiring intellectual wealth. It is evident they are creatures of study, like ourselves; that their knowledge is not innate, but acquired; that no mental endowments, however powerful and comprehensive, supersede intellectual effort; that their wisdom is progressive; and it would appear, too, that though the wide universe with all its wonders and boundless treasures of knowledge is open to their view, they are more intensely drawn towards the wonders of redemption, with its mysteries of justice, holiness, and love, and the brighter displays it affords of the moral grandeur of God. With a nature so intellectual, with powers of perception so clear and comprehensive, with the stimulus of an intense desire for knowledge, and the facilities which heaven must afford for its acquisition, how vast must be the treasures of knowledge which angels must have accumulated during the thousands of years through which they have lived in the immediate presence of God! and yet their highest attainments now, will one day be surpassed by the humblest and most unlettered child of God.

8. *Angels are beings of great power.*—'Strong angel' and 'mighty angel,' are terms we read in the Apocalypse. The name Gabriel means *the mighty one of God;* and among the designations of angelic orders we find that of powers (δυνάμεις). The attribute of extraordinary power pertains to angelic natures in general, as we learn from David, who exclaims, 'Bless the Lord, ye his angels, who excel in strength.' It is impossible to form any comparison between the power of a spiritual being, such as an angel, and the physical power of man, which is limited by his organization. If, however, the power of man be estimated by the wondrous effects he can produce by his superior knowledge, and the appliances he can use, we have then displays which may give us some faint idea of the resources of angelic power, for probably their superior knowledge of nature would enable them to employ in a far higher degree than ourselves the resources of the universe, to fulfil any com-

mission which God might give them to perform. Whatever be the mode or media by which their powers are exerted, the effects thereof are astounding. Milton describes them as plucking the seated hills from their foundations and hurling them on their antagonists. This is poetry; but in the records of Scripture we have truth without the colour of fiction; and here we find one angel, as a minister of vengeance, destroying 70 thousand persons of the kingdom of David in three days; another destroying in one night 85 thousand stout warriors in the mail-clad army of Assyria's proud monarch; and another destroying all the first-born of Egypt in one single night. In the Apocalypse we see angels holding the four winds of heaven, discharging the vials, and wielding the thunders of Jehovah's wrath upon the guilty nations; the old earth trembles under the displays of their mighty power as the ministers of a sin-avenging God. But angels are equally powerful for good; and while their holy nature makes them the faithful executors of justice, their benevolence, as well as their holiness, makes them delight to employ their energies in the service of mercy. Hence we notice, in the next place, that

9. *Angels have ever been actively employed as agents in the administration of Providence.*

The history of our world is replete with angelic agency. From the Mosaic record of the first day's work, to the great drama in which this world shall perish in the general conflagration, we trace their footsteps, we hear their voices, and we behold their ministrations. When our world rose at Jehovah's bidding from rude chaos into beauteous order, those 'morning stars sang together, those exalted sons of God shouted for joy;' at the day of judgment they shall take part in the great transactions of that closing scene; and during every intervening period their agency is employed. God works in nature by physical laws, in providence by moral laws which are higher than natural laws, and to which the economy of nature is always subordinate; and within these comprehensive spheres of operation the agency of angels comes, and how much is due to their commissioned activity and intervention mortals cannot determine.

Heathen philosophers and poets often spoke of the ministry of spiritual beings. Socrates often spoke of a good demon at-

tending him, and directing and guiding him by his admonitions.* Plato taught that the higher kind of demons, such as had never dwelt in mortal bodies, were appointed guardians unto men.† But old Hesiod ascribes a ministering agency to the spirits that had once inhabited mortal bodies during the golden age, and speaks of them as

> 'Aerial spirits, by great Jove design'd
> To be on earth the guardians of mankind.
> Invisible to mortal eyes they go,
> And mark our actions good or bad below;
> The immortal spies with watchful care preside,
> And twice ten thousand round their charges glide;
> They can reward with glory or with gold,
> A power they by divine permission hold.'‡

We have here a brief representation of that general sentiment on the offices of these superior beings, which we find so abundantly amplified in the speculations of philosophers, and the dreamy fictions of the poets. But with what steadfast foot we tread when, leaving the flitting theories and amusing dramas of the heathen, we come to the substantial verities of revelation, and in the narrative of simple truth hear what God has said and saints have seen of the angel world. In no offices performed by these holy beings, do they appear so interesting to us as when we see them, where most we see them, ministering in the affairs of our redemption and personal salvation.

How constant their attendance on the Incarnate Saviour during his mysterious life amongst men! At his birth they are his heralds, and with songs exultant announce the glad tidings to mankind. In his temptation they minister to him; in his agonies they succour him; on his resurrection they are the first to proclaim his triumph; on his ascension they come to escort him to the mediatorial throne; in his glorified state they render him supreme homage as their Lord; and when he returns to judge the world they will form his retinue! What sublime thoughts would be suggested, what emotions of wonder and joy would be excited, by the scenes they witnessed on earth and still witness in heaven, in reference to Christ, his two-fold nature, and his great redeeming work. *God incarnate!* This was new to them. They had seen the Son in his Deity; but never till now enshrined in humanity. What amazing condescension!

* Memorabilia, Xen., lib. 1. † Apuleius de Deo Socrates.
‡ Op. et Dies, Cooke's translation, lib. 1, ver. 120.

Obeying his own law as if he were a mere creature, and in the attitude of a servant! This was new. They had seen him as the governor of the universe; but never till now as a subject! *Encountering Satan in conflict and prolonged temptation!* This was new. They had seen him frown the arch-rebel from his presence and hurl him to perdition; but never till now submitting to be tempted by him whose subtilty and power had seduced myriads to eternal ruin. *Suffering the scorn and reproach of sinful men!* This was new. They had seen myriads of happy spirits worship, adore, and love him; but never till now had they seen him personally insulted, reproached, and maltreated by his creatures. *Groaning in Gethsemane, and crucified between two thieves, and dying as a sacrificial victim!* This was new. They had seen him supremely happy and glorious; but to see him agonize, to hear that dying wail, and to behold him a bloody corpse, and all this to save the world which had revolted from him! What mysterious love! *To see him, after all this, enthroned and glorified in human nature.* This was a new fact in the moral history of the universe. The whole scenes were full of interest, wonder, and mystery; a gradation of wonders rising in succession, until they culminated in the permanent presence of the God-man, resplendent with a glory that fills the heaven of heavens. Here were chapters of instruction for angelic minds to ponder; here were developments of hidden truths; here were discoveries of the Divine perfections, never known before; and still unfolding in brighter effulgence as ages roll on!

Angels minister to man personally and individually. This is not imaginary. It is a truth asserted in a form which gives it emphasis:—'Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who are heirs of salvation?' This office then pertains to all; not to one order, but to every order; not to some in each order, but to each angel in every order: the highest in rank is made a servant to man in the sense of ministering for his good. Hence Gabriel, the mighty one of God, and Michael the archangel, we find mentioned by name as messengers from God to man. How numerous the proofs of this ministry! The cherubim appeared at Eden, where the shekinah was displayed, and man bowed in holy worship; in the sanctuary of the tabernacle and the tem-

ple, their mysterious figures were radiant in the glory of the Divine presence. To the patriarchs, the angels ofttimes came with promises from God; and the crowded ladder, connecting earth with heaven, showed how constantly their bright forms were despatched on errands of loving service to mankind. At the giving of the law on Sinai they officiated amid awful manifestations of Jehovah's majesty. To Elijah they ministered in the dreary desert, and bore him in triumph when translated to the skies; Elisha's person they surrounded by thousands, protecting him like a wall of fire; to Isaiah, Daniel, and Zechariah, they appeared in sublime vision; and Ezekiel saw them moving with the mystic wheels of Providence, and worshipping in profoundest reverence. To the Virgin Mary the angel Gabriel appeared, bearing the message that she should be honoured as the mother of our Lord; and to Zacharias, foretelling the birth of holy John. Lazarus they carried from a world of suffering to Abraham's bosom. Again and again the apostles saw angelic messengers, and were delivered or comforted by their ministrations; the beloved disciple John received their testimony, and beheld them in various orders and countless numbers around the throne, and heard them blending their anthems with the songs of the glorified Church of God.

The ministry of angels for the saints is a matter of special promise; for it is said, 'He shall give his angels charge over thee;' and, 'The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them, and delivereth them.' Hence the ministry of angels is as real now as it was in the ages of patriarchs, prophets, and apostles. True, we do not see their radiant forms, but they are here, about our path by night and by day, shielding us in danger, succouring us in our conflicts, and ministering to our comforts in a thousand ways. There is but a thin veil between them and us. Could our eyes be opened, as were the eyes of Elisha's servant, we should behold them marshalled around the Church of God, or ascending and descending between earth and heaven, as Jacob saw them in his midnight vision, and as some of God's saints seem to see and hear them when on the confines of the spirit world. The ministry of angels reveals so much sympathy and love for man, so tender an interest in his welfare, and such delight in doing him good, that they might be our elder brethren; and so they are in an exalted sense, as

the sons of God; the first-born of our heavenly Father, as heirs of the same blessed inheritance, and our companions in eternal felicity.

10. *Angels are immortal beings.*—How long they have existed we know not: revelation is silent on this subject. Certainly their creation was prior to the existence of man. Some theologians think they were once inhabitants of our world, antecedent to that chaotic state mentioned in Gen. i. 2; and that their deep interest in man grows out of their former relation to our world. This may be true, but is it not more likely their love to man grows out of their supreme love to God, exciting them to delight in beings who bear his image, and who are redeemed by the interposition of God's own Son? The fact that the Son of God is enshrined in the nature of man, is enough to attract all heaven in sympathy towards our race. Whether or not the angels once occupied our earth as their abode, their creation may have been chiliads of years ere man was brought into being. But however long the duration of the past, it is as nothing compared with the duration of the future. The immeasurable ages which will roll on through futurity will not exhaust, nor one moment diminish, the period of their being. Nothing can measure or parallel their future existence, but the life-time of the eternal God. What imparts grandeur to this existence is, that their nature will never wax old. Ages, however vast, will never dim their vision, nor enfeeble their activity, nor impair their memory, nor chill their affections, nor bring the slightest decay on their intellectual powers. Immortal youth will supplement the blessedness of eternal life. Hence, angels always appear young, with the fresh blush of vigour on their radiant forms.

11. *Angels are beings of unspeakable happiness.*—Happy, because they are holy; for sin, the only source of misery, is absent from their nature. Happy, because their society is unmixed; all the inhabitants of heaven are holy like themselves, and no jealousy or animosity can disturb their harmony. Happy, because they know they are safe; their probation is passed, and no apprehension of danger can cloud their prospect into futurity. Happy, because they are immortal, and are conscious of immortality, and therefore may welcome the cycles of time without fear of an end. Happy, because they know

that their faculties are formed for increasing vigour, and their capacities for everlasting expansion; so that while surveying the attainments of the past with gratitude, they can contemplate the future with the certainty of continuous accumulation of intellectual treasures, and advancement in moral excellence and blessedness. Happy, because God himself is their portion, and he is the fountain of knowledge, holiness, and happiness, to replenish their ever-widening capacities, and satisfy the intensest longings and the highest aspirations of their exalted nature. Hence it is that we see these blessed spirits always jubilant; their harps are never silent, their anthems never cease. Filled with rapturous joy, 'they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.'

Yet, great and happy as angels are now, it does not follow that the highest of them has a nature greater and nobler than that of man. True, man is said to have been made 'a little lower than the angels:' but that I take to mean, lower in condition, not in nature; lower than the angels were at the time of man's creation; but not lower than the angels were when they were brought into being. Man was made in the image and likeness of God: what higher than that can distinguish a created being? He is also made for endless existence; what more durable than eternity? He is endued with powers of unlimited expansion and elevation, and thus has infinity impressed upon his powers, as well as eternity upon his being. Yet, angels are greater *now* in their attainments of dignity and happiness than man is at present, because their nature being not stationary, but progressive, they have been advancing, it may be for millions of ages, in intellectual attainments and in every moral excellence. But the nature of man, equal, if not superior, to theirs in its constitutional powers, and formed like theirs for progressive advancement through the eternity of its being, shall rise to the heights where angels now dwell, and, in the distant periods of its being, surpass every attainment which now distinguishes their exalted state.

Let us, then, often think of the angels as our elder brethren and fellow-heirs of God. Let us so live, as to encourage their ministrations, and secure their companionship and fellowship through an eternity of bliss.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE DEVIL AND HIS ANGELS.

1. *Their real personal existence.*—Holy Scripture affords the same evidence of the existence of evil angels as of good ones. The attempt of our modern Sadducees to resolve them into a figure of speech, a metaphorical personification of evil, is pitiful in the extreme. It is a cunning device of the Devil himself to persuade men to deny his existence, that he may the more easily and effectually secure them in his toils, and that by a sceptical perversion of one part of Holy Scripture, he may the more easily induce them to deny others. The same mode of reasoning would divest the Holy Spirit itself of his personality, and resolve him into an influence, or an attribute, and render the sacred volume, not a book adapted to instruct the reader, but to mislead and deceive him. Satan a metaphor! How could a metaphor cry out in agony, 'Art thou come to torment us before the time?' How could a metaphor pass from a man into a herd of swine and cause their instant destruction? How could a metaphor be judged at the last day, and be doomed to a state of everlasting misery? Away with such egregious trifling, such perversions of God's Holy Word. All the attributes, actions, and modes of being, proper to a real personal existence, are ascribed to evil spirits; and the records of their personal character, doings, and destiny, form the darkest and most admonitory pages of the sacred volume.

2. *They are fallen angels.*—Good and evil angels, however unlike in their character and condition now, were originally of the same nature, and enjoyed together the same state of blessedness; hence they are called, by an appellation common to both, '*Angels*'—and the sole cause of their difference is the continued holiness of the one and the apostasy of the other. Good angels are designated 'the elect angels,' which implies that they were once in a probationary state, and having proved faithful, are chosen to live and reign with God in unchangeable and everlasting happiness; but those who are described as evil angels, were unfaithful, and fell into sin, and having fallen are consigned to endless misery.

It is interesting to observe how widely the notion of evil spirits has prevailed. It pertains to all ages and almost to all countries. Plutarch says, 'It was a very ancient opinion, that there are certain wicked and malignant demons, who envy good men, and endeavour to hinder them in the pursuit of virtue, lest they should be partakers at least of greater happiness than they enjoy.'* Whence that ancient opinion but from the scattered beams of early revelation? Yet this truth, like all others of Divine origin, has become perverted by fable and speculation, and superstition has even made devils an object of worship. In Africa, Burmah, Ceylon, Persia, Chaldea, and in many parts of the East Indies,† devil worship is practised, and offerings as well as prayers are presented to assuage the wrath of evil demons, and avert the calamities they are supposed to have the power to inflict. The origin of their malignant nature is ascribed to various causes; and among these we find the notion of an apostasy, substantially in accordance with the teaching of revelation.

The Scriptures, adapted solely to usefulness, and not to gratify a prurient curiosity, give but little information respecting the cause and manner of their apostasy. Some grave theologians, as well as poets, interpreting literally the conflict between Michael and the dragon and their angels, in Rev. xii. 7—9, have described heaven as the place where the rebellion of apostate angels occurred, when the latter were vanquished and consigned to hell. This however is a grave mistake, for that apocalyptic scene is clearly not historic, but prophetic of a moral or spiritual conflict and triumph pertaining to Gospel times, when Satan shall be defeated and his power overthrown.

It is the opinion of many learned men that our earth was originally the abode of angels, where, ages prior to the creation of man, they lived in a state of probation, when some fell and were banished; others were faithful, and were exalted to a higher and happier state. The authors of this theory suppose that the moral catastrophe of their fall was followed by that physical catastrophe, which produced the chaos described in Genesis i. 2.‡ This, though but an opinion, is more prob-

* Plut. de Defect. Orac., p. 431, tom. 2. Edit. Paris, 1624.

† See also Travels of Niebuhr, Ives, and Layard.

‡ Among the supporters of this theory are the following:—Kurtz, in his

able than the supposition that the apostasy of angels took place in heaven, as described by Milton and others.

Wherever was the place of their apostasy, it would appear that pride entered largely into the defection of the arch-fiend and his followers. Hence Paul guards us against pride as 'the condemnation of the devil.'—1 Tim. iii. 6. The words of Jude on this dread apostasy favour this view; for he says, 'And the angels which kept not their first estate (*τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν*, literally, their own principality or dignity), but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains (*δεσμοῖς*, in bonds) under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.' This language, though brief and obscure, seems to point to pride as exciting dissatisfaction with their state, and inducing an unlawful attempt to claim a higher position than their own.* Revelation carries us no further into this dark and mysterious subject; conjecture is in vain, and might mislead. Let us prudently stop where the light ceases to shine. Whatever the sin was, and wherever committed, the language of Jude describes it as a voluntary act; and as such it was a sin against infinite goodness and love, and an insult to the majesty of heaven. How awful were the results! These rebel angels were severed from God, and consigned to eternal perdition, and their doom stands revealed as a solemn admonition of the heinous nature and the ruinous consequences of sin.

3. *The rebel angels are awfully numerous.*—Judea, during the time of our Lord's ministry, seems to have been thronged with evil spirits, attracted thither probably by the presence of Christ, as if resolved to confront him in his benevolent purpose, and by their combined energies to thwart his benevolent mis-

elaborate work on the covenant; Delitzsch, the author of a voluminous commentary on the Old Testament; and Bôhme, St Martin, J. M. Hahn, Meyer, Hamberger, Rochall, Reichel, Steir, Schlegel, Schubert, Kniewel, Drechster, Rudelbach, Guericke, Baumgarten, Lebeau, A. Wagner, Michaelis, Richers, and Rougemont. This notion does not appear to have been defended by the Fathers, but we find a trace of it so early as the tenth century; for Edgar, king of England, is represented as saying in confirmation of the law of Oswald, 'As God drove the angels from the earth after their fall, whereupon it was changed into chaos, he had now placed kings upon earth that justice might obtain.' If Edgar derived this notion from his Christian instructors, it may have come down from a higher antiquity. After all, it is but a theory, and even if true it is not capable of proof in the present state of our knowledge.

* A desire identical with the main temptation by which Satan induced our first parents to sin.

sion, and overthrow his redeeming work. That a great number were present at that period we have the fullest proof, seeing so many of the Jewish people were afflicted with demoniacal possession; some to an awful extent. Seven evil spirits were cast out of one person, and a legion out of another. While many of these apostate spirits were located in Judea,* the whole heathen world was under their sway, conveying the sad idea of vast numbers being involved in the great apostasy; though we may reasonably hope they bear but a small proportion to the still greater number who remained faithful to God and kept their first estate.

4. *Among evil angels there are various ranks, or different degrees of authority.*—Hence, speaking of these spiritual foes, Paul says that Christ hath 'spoiled principalities and powers, and made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it,' —Col. ii. 15; and referring to the conflicts of believers with them, he says, 'We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness' (or wicked spirits, *τα πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας*). The distinction of orders here indicated seems like that existing, at least in part, among

* Various attempts, displaying more ingenuity than candour, have been made to resolve the cases of possession into madness, a notion contradicted alike by the description given in the sacred narrative, by the direct testimony of the evangelists themselves, and by the conduct of our Lord in addressing the demons as such, and in expelling them by his command. There is another theory which supposes that the beings which possessed men were not fallen angels, but wicked human spirits, or some other order of malignant spirits. In support of this notion it is alleged that in Greek they are called, not devils (*διάβολοι*), but demons (*δαίμονες* and *δαιμόνια*). This, however, has no weight, if both words were used by the Jews to denote the same class of beings; and that they were so used, and used to denote fallen angels, is evident from the narrative of the evangelists, and by the plain and direct testimony of the Jews, and of our Lord himself; and we have this testimony recorded by three evangelists in the most emphatic and formal manner. When the Pharisees and Scribes could no longer deny our Lord's miraculous power in casting out evil spirits, they ascribed his power to Beelzebub or Satan himself, and our Lord replied, 'How can Satan cast out Satan? If Satan cast out Satan he is divided against himself. How then shall his kingdom stand?' Here it is evident that Beelzebub, Satan, devil, and demon, are spoken of as one and the same class of beings, elsewhere called 'unclean spirits,' or the devil and his angels. It seems, indeed, that the several epithets of Diabolus, Satan, and Beelzebub, are only different terms to denote one and the same being—the arch-fiend, who is the chief of the infernal beings; while demon, which is used in the plural as well as the singular, is the term common to all the host of fallen angels, whatever be their rank or condition.

angels of God; and it is remarkable that as we read of but archangel, so we read of but one devil,—the word διάβολος, en applied to an infernal agent, being always found in the gular number. Thus the hosts of hell, though existing, it y be, in various orders, are under the chieftainship of one er, exceeding the rest in craft and power, as he does in lignity and wickedness, and probably the leader in their ostasy.

5. *The fallen angels are sunk into deep depravity.*—The law dependency is universal, because God alone is the fountain all being and of all good. Every creature, however high in scale of existence, is dependent on God, not only for its ng, but for its goodness; and therefore its goodness or holi- s can be perpetuated only by union with Him. Sin severs soul from God; and severed from him, the soul is deprived his favour, and of his strength to uphold it in virtue and dness; and deprived of his favour and sustaining power, s thrown upon itself, and becomes actuated by its own ish instinct; and as selfishness becomes intensified, there is sin, however deep in guilt and malignity, that may not grow of it. Such has been the direct effect of the apostasy of els. The selfishness which engendered the first sin has, ing the lapse of ages, produced and developed every malig- t principle which now so darkly stains their condition. red of God produces hatred of all good—of all good in it- and of all beings that are good, and of envy at their hap- ss. From hatred and envy springs the desire to corrupt tever is good, and destroy whatever is happy. This desire s its end by stratagem, deceit, and all available means in reach. The arch-fiend is called 'Satan,' which means dversary; 'The old serpent,' because of his guile; 'A 'a liar from the beginning,' 'the father of lies,' and en he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own.' He is called ollyon,' which means Destroyer, because he delighteth in roying the souls of men, and 'goeth about as a roaring seeking whom he may devour.' Not only is he a de- er, but 'a murderer,' a murderer of both bodies and souls; is arts of seduction having murder as its ultimate object. he sin and misery of our world for six thousand years, and he sin and misery of its future history, and all the misery

of hell, is not only the result of his agency and influence, but results in which he and his minions find their gratification.

6. *Evil spirits are beings of great power.*—Their apostasy, though divesting them of the moral excellences they originally possessed, destroyed not their great intellectual and natural energies. Their intelligence is indeed corrupted by cunning, their power is become the servant of malignity, and their ability to do good is perverted into a faculty for evil, and renders them formidable adversaries to man. Hence we read of 'the depths of Satan;' of the god of this world who blindeth the minds of the ungodly; of the ruler of this world, and of 'the dragon which deceiveth the whole world,' and whose 'tail drew after him a third part of the stars of heaven.' These words set forth dreadful powers to deceive and destroy. It was Satanic agency that afflicted Job from head to foot with sore boils, that raised the storm which buried his sons and daughters in one common ruin, and that would have destroyed the patriarch himself, had not the hand of omnipotence restrained the malignity. What powers infernal spirits had to dethrone the reason and torture the bodies of men we see in the raving maniacs and the agonizing victims they possessed in the days of our Lord. Moreover, all the Babels of superstition, the pantheons of idolatry, the crimes that have ruined empires, the wars that have covered the earth with blood, and the miseries that have filled the air with human lamentation and woe, are truly called the works of the devil, because proceeding from that tremendous power by which he hath deceived, depraved, and ruined the successive generations of mankind.

7. *Crafty and powerful as evil spirits are, they are limited.*—They may learn the character of man, but they are not omniscient; they may suggest evil, but they cannot coerce the will; they may spread their snares around men, but cannot force them into those snares; they may have power over the elements, but their power is restrained and limited; and while the providence of God protects his people, his word and Spirit are adequate to countervail and prostrate all Satanic stratagem, influence, and power. Nor should the faithful Christian for one moment despond because of the severity and malignity of his temptations. Satan had the audacity to assail our Lord himself; no wonder if he assail his followers. He tempted the

oly One of God to forsake his mission for worldly glory; to
strust his Father's goodness; and even to worship the devil.
hat temptation viler than such can the adversary suggest to
e child of God? Take courage, then. Our great High Priest
us tempted in all points like unto us, yet without sin. Faint
t, thou child of God, but resist the devil and he will flee from
u; and while repelling his attacks, remember always, that it
no sin to be tempted, it is sin only when we yield to tempta-
n. The sin pertains to the tempter, not to the faithful soul;
d will not lay the sins of their enemy to the charge of his
n people.

8. *Fallen angels are immortal.*—Much as they can destroy,
y cannot destroy their own existence. Miserable as they
, they are doomed to be miserable for ever. This is a neces-
y consequence of their irremediable depravity, the tendency
which is not to diminish, but to increase and deepen by in-
gence and age, and thus to perpetuate itself and its conse-
nces for ever. Moreover, it is the decree of God that they
ll be publicly arraigned before his tribunal at the great day,
then consigned to that state and degree of misery their sins
erve. Thus, they are said to be 'reserved under darkness
o the judgment at the great day;' and the final doom of
ed men is 'to depart, accursed, into everlasting fire pre-
d for the devil and his angels;' partners with him in sin,
are to suffer with him and his angels in everlasting
ent. The darkness deepens as we look into the awful
re. May the reader take heed to the faithful warnings of
, and flee from the wrath to come!

382

ERRATUM.

Page 80, note, *for* εστινὸ *read* εστιν ὁ

JOHN CHILDS AND SON, PRINTERS.

3999/n

BT 77.3 .C66 1869
Cooke, William, 1806-1884.
Christian theology

NO LONGER PROPERTY OF
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY
MAY 1948
CINCINNATI, O.